

## **Historic, archived document**

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.



# MISCELLANEOUS FOREST LEGISLATION

---

PLEASE RETURN TO USDA  
NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY  
LAW BRANCH, LEGISLATIVE REPORTING,  
Rm. 117-E, Admin Bldg.  
Wash. D. C. Ext. 4654

## HEARINGS

BEFORE THE  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON FORESTS  
OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
EIGHTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS  
SECOND SESSION  
ON

H.R. 7195, H.R. 8535, H.R. 9219, H.R. 9220, H.R. 9274,  
H.R. 9545, H.R. 9728, H.R. 10835, H.R. 10853, H.R. 11111,  
H.R. 12434, S. 3064, and S. 3112

---

JULY 23, 24, 25, 1962

---

Serial LL

---

Printed for the use of the Committee on Agriculture



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON : 1962

## COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

HAROLD D. COOLEY, North Carolina, *Chairman*

W. R. POAGE, Texas, *Vice Chairman*

GEORGE GRANT, Alabama  
E. C. GATHINGS, Arkansas  
JOHN L. McMILLAN, South Carolina  
THOMAS G. ABERNETHY, Mississippi  
WATKINS M. ABBITT, Virginia  
PAUL C. JONES, Missouri  
HARLAN HAGEN, California  
LESTER R. JOHNSON, Wisconsin  
ROSS BASS, Tennessee  
W. PAT JENNINGS, Virginia  
D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS, Florida  
MERWIN COAD, Iowa  
J. FLOYD BREEDING, Kansas  
FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD, Kentucky  
HAROLD B. McSWEEN, Louisiana  
DANIEL K. INOUE, Hawaii  
RALPH R. HARDING, Idaho  
G. ELLIOTT HAGAN, Georgia  
GRAHAM PURCELL, Texas

CHARLES B. HOEVEN, Iowa  
PAUL B. DAGUE, Pennsylvania  
PAGE BELCHER, Oklahoma  
CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE, Maine  
CHARLES M. TEAGUE, California  
ALBERT H. QUIE, Minnesota  
DON L. SHORT, North Dakota  
CATHERINE MAY, Washington  
DELBERT L. LATTA, Ohio  
RALPH HARVEY, Indiana  
PAUL FINDLEY, Illinois  
ROBERT DOLE, Kansas  
RALPH F. BEERMANN, Nebraska  
BEN REIFEL, South Dakota

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

A. FERNÓS-ISERN, Puerto Rico

Mrs. CHRISTINE S. GALLAGHER, *Clerk*

HYDE H. MURRAY, *Assistant Clerk*

JOHN J. HEIMBURGER, *Counsel*

FRANCIS M. LEMAY, *Staff Consultant*

---

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON FORESTS

GEORGE GRANT, Alabama, *Chairman*

JOHN L. McMILLAN, South Carolina  
W. PAT JENNINGS, Virginia  
D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS, Florida  
HAROLD B. McSWEEN, Louisiana  
RALPH R. HARDING, Idaho  
G. ELLIOTT HAGAN, Georgia

CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE, Maine  
CHARLES M. TEAGUE, California  
DON L. SHORT, North Dakota  
CATHERINE MAY, Washington

# COOPERATIVE FOREST MANAGEMENT

---

TUESDAY, JULY 24, 1962

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON FORESTS OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,  
*Washington, D.C.*

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 11:15 a.m., in room 1310, New House Office Building, Hon. George M. Grant (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Grant, McMillan, Abernethy, Hagen of California, Jennings, Matthews, Harding, Hagan of Georgia, McIntire, and Short.

Also present: Christine Gallagher, clerk.

Mr. GRANT. Now we will take up H.R. 9728.

I believe the first witness here from the Department is Mr. A. R. Spillers.

## STATEMENT OF A. R. SPILLERS, DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF COOPERATIVE FOREST MANAGEMENT, FOREST SERVICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. SPILLERS. Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee on Forests, I am happy to be with you today to talk in favor of H.R. 9728 and H.R. 9953. Gentlemen, if you will forgive me for one personal reference. I am proud to have been associated with this farm forestry program since its inception in 1937 with the exception of the World War II years, and I have been in charge of it since 1947.

This program is built around the cooperation between the Forest Service and the State foresters with their 650-700 farm foresters. Farm foresters—or service foresters, as they are called in some States—are our State and private forest management and processing specialists on the ground. They are the foresters who help the woodland owners and loggers do the many technical jobs of management and utilization. They are the frontline troops of almost any forestry activity which involves small woodland ownership. In addition to regular duties they have been called upon to help expand timber production for World War II and make surveys for the timber resource review. They are now assisting in the agricultural conservation program and the stimulation of employment opportunities by the rural areas development program.

In connection with the timber resource review, it was found that the small private forest ownerships in the United States hold the key to the Nation's future timber supply. There are 4.5 million such ownerships. Their average size is 59 acres. Their 257 million acres amount



to about half of all the commercial forest land in the Nation and they comprise the most accessible and potentially some of the most productive woodland. Unfortunately, many of these acres are producing at only one-third of their potential timber growing capacity.

If this large acreage of forest land is to furnish its share of the Nation's future timber supply, sawtimber growth on these lands must be doubled within the next four decades. Likewise, full production of quality timber by these small forest ownerships is necessary to insure full contribution of the resources of these lands in solving the problem of substantial and persistent underemployment in many rural areas. You will be interested to know that about 59 percent of the counties "designated" as having serious unemployment problems have more than one-half of their entire land resources classed as woodland.

Neither of these goals can be attained without skillful application of technical forestry practices on these small forest properties. Technical management skills are needed to evaluate the complex factors of soil, slope, elevation, species, growth, quality, markets, and other variables which make each area different and difficult to prescribe proper silvicultural treatment. Few owners have the necessary technical skills to manage timber crops, nor do any of them have enough timber individually to warrant hiring a forester even on a part-time basis. The same situation confronts them in the difficult jobs of marketing specialized products, preparing sale contracts, and timber harvesting. Similarly, small industries have problems in manufacturing techniques and plant efficiency in connection with the processing of primary forest products.

In the last year of record, 1961, we reached almost 90,000 small woodland owners. This seems like a lot but it is still only 2 percent of the total. We are making progress but we should be reaching annually about 5 percent of the small woodland owners. For the fiscal year 1962, planned State appropriations account for \$3,386,000 or 58 percent of the estimated \$5,886,000 total program cost. The States have steadily increased cooperative forest management program funds and increases have been made in Federal appropriations to the limit of \$2,500,000 presently authorized under the act. However, the demands for technical forestry services far exceed the ability of the program under this limitation. The States fully recognize the need to strengthen the program but anticipated increases in State funds alone cannot be expected to carry the load. Investment in woodland improvement and utilization will help alleviate rural unemployment and contribute to both the gross national product and the long-term growth rate of the Nation.

The increased annual appropriation which H.R. 9728 and H.R. 9953 would authorize would be a step in the right direction. However, for the reasons stated in the Department's report, it is recommended that the bills be amended so as to remove the statutory limitation.

Thank you, gentlemen. I will be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. GRANT. Thank you very much.

As I understand it, this is to help the farmer on a cooperative basis with a man who gets down to the grassroots, so to speak, by whatever name—district forester—the man I think in my section of the country is there with an area of three, four, five, or six counties. He visits those counties and visits the individual farmers.

Mr. SPILLERS. Yes sir.

Mr. GRANT. He helps the farmer lay out a plan for a limited number of acres.

Mr. SPILLERS. That is absolutely right, sir. The men are State employees. They are employed by the State forester. The Forest Service is a partner in the program. We furnish part of the funds from Federal sources. We assist in the training and in the supervision of the men. But the farm foresters, the service foresters, or area foresters, are State employees.

Mr. GRANT. And with a limitation on row cropping—cotton, corn, tobacco, wheat, peanuts, and other things—this is about the last resort that a small farmer can go to, timber growing on the acres that he diverts from row crops.

Mr. SPILLERS. Yes.

Mr. GRANT. Are there any questions?

Mr. JENNINGS. Has any attempt been made to coordinate activities of other Federal and State agencies that are operating in this same category, or operating with the same group of people?

Mr. SPILLERS. We have given it a lot of thought. We think the best way to do this job is through the cooperative program with the State.

These foresters employed under these bills are State employees, and we feel that that is the best way to get a dollar's worth of Federal money, to put it out with the State in a cooperative program.

Mr. JENNINGS. Do you think that will preserve States' rights, to let the Federal Government furnish the money and the States determine how it should be spent, and who they will employ, and so forth?

Mr. SPILLERS. We are working on an annual program with the State foresters and a plan is drawn up each year, a budget is prepared each year, the plan is made, the States spend their money first, then we reimburse them up to the maximum of 50 percent as called for under this act.

Mr. JENNINGS. If you got the \$5 million rather than \$2.5 million, would that change the proportionate ratio from a 50-50 proposition to 60-40 or 75-25?

Mr. SPILLERS. There would be no change in the matching provision.

Mr. JENNINGS. It would just employ additional people?

Mr. SPILLERS. That is right.

Mr. JENNINGS. You think we can do that better through the Federal Government by appropriating more money rather than leaving this to the States and having them appropriate the money, also?

Mr. SPILLERS. This program, Mr. Jennings, has been set up since 1937.

Mr. JENNINGS. A lot of these programs have been set up since that time, since 1932.

Can you tell me of a program we have set up we have terminated or let expire?

Mr. McINTIRE. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. JENNINGS. No; we changed that and about everything else. We made four different bureaus out of the RFC.

Mr. McINTIRE. That has been years and years before.



Mr. JENNINGS. We changed that over to private ownership and instead of getting rid of RFC we have had about four different organizations, including the SEA.

I am not opposed to all of them, but we have not gotten rid of any of these organizations that I can think of.

Can you think of any that have phased out?

Mr. SPILLERS. Not at the moment; no, sir.

Mr. JENNINGS. Let me ask you this question: Would you recommend this be increased from \$2.5 to \$5 million if we had to borrow the money to pay the States?

Mr. SPILLERS. Mr. Jennings, I think this is a very worthwhile activity. I think the limitation does not quite provide the funds necessary for it.

Mr. JENNINGS. No; but that is just the first step. Once we authorize it, the next thing to do is to act on our authorization. You say it was authorized and it is a commitment, moral obligation, on the part of the Congress to provide the funds that were authorized. This is just the first step and the second step is actually appropriating moneys.

Mr. SPILLERS. We realize that, Mr. Jennings.

We expect to go before the Appropriations Committee each time, you see, for this.

Mr. GRANT. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. GRANT. On the record.

Mr. JENNINGS. If the Federal Government is going to spend funds, should we not oversee these funds and be responsible for their direction? Should we not take the blame if they are misappropriated and take the credit if they are properly expended? I can tell you this is not happening with most of these cooperative funds. These people are State employees.

They would not even acknowledge, back some time ago, that 50 percent of the money comes from the Federal Government that pays them. They will go on record as opposing it if you will leave it up to them, not as an individual, but endorsing this overall philosophy.

May I point this out: Can we not coordinate some of these activities? We have got too many people farming the farmers, and this is just going to add to it. If I had to pick out one group who is doing a good job assisting the farmers, your group would rate right up at the top of the list, because they are doing a fine job. I think you are doing a fine job, but somewhere down the line the Secretary of Agriculture or the Congress should see if we cannot take a little from one of these other agencies and give it to the Forest Service which is doing such a fine job instead of adding more and more.

It would take a farmer a day just to go to all of these agencies represented in the county seat.

That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, I would certainly want the record to show that the members of the committee have taken note of this: The fact that Mr. Spillers has headed this program since 1947. I think that is a very commendable record and relationship which has been established under the program at the State level, and certainly everything I know of it shows it has proceeded in an excellent way. Just as one member of the committee, I want to make note of the fact that



your long capable service in administering the funds under this act has been recognized and appreciated.

I think the record should also note that in fiscal year 1961, the Federal appropriation was \$1,354,000, but that the State contribution of matching funds was \$2,941,000, which is a ratio of almost 1 to 3. There are a number of States where the ratio of contribution to Federal contribution will run from 1 to 3, to 1 to 5, and 6, which is an interesting point to establish in the record.

While this bill is seeking an authorization to increase from \$2.5 million to some other figure, the Senate bill is putting the figure at \$5 million.

You in the Department are recommending it to be an open-end authorization?

Mr. SPILLERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. McINTIRE. From the enactment of the bill, which I am assuming authorized \$2.5 million, was that in the additional legislation?

Mr. SPILLERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. McINTIRE. To date this figure for 1961 fiscal year was \$1.3 million?

Mr. SPILLERS. Yes, sir; 1962 was \$2.5 million.

Mr. McINTIRE. Progressively, the use of this authorization has been strictly on the basis of a program as it has developed and on the justification that you make to the Appropriations Committee?

I am assuming that it is your plan, under any extended authorization, under any increase of authorization, that this approach will prevail and that you are ready with respect to justifying the expenditure that you shall recommend to the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. SPILLERS. Absolutely, Mr. McIntire.

Mr. GRANT. Thank you very much.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, just as a matter of interest on how that works, I have observed the county board of supervisors in the State and this is how that works. They come down to the local level, the State government, and say, "The Federal Government appropriated this much money and it is only going to cost us half. If we can get this man for half, it is only going to cost us that much so we should take advantage of it."

They do take advantage of it and the Federal Government representatives come to the Appropriations Committee and say, "The States appropriated this much money and they have asked for this. If we do not appropriate, it will only cost us half, so we will not be able to take advantage of that situation otherwise."

They say we have a moral commitment, a moral obligation if they put up some money and we cannot match it. One encourages the other and the county gets into the crossfire of the situation.

I think the Forest Service is doing a good job.

Has any thought been given to putting these people under the local forest ranger.

Mr. SPILLERS. Mr. Jennings, in all the years I have been connected with this program we have never met the demand of local farmers for this technical assistance. Each year we have had a lot more requests for work than we could possibly handle.

As to putting a man under the local forest rangers, in most States these farm foresters work directly under the State district foresters so there is no duplication there.

Mr. JENNINGS. Is there any coordination?

Mr. SPILLERS. Absolutely. When a man works under the district forester, the district forester is his boss.

Mr. JENNINGS. The district forester is a State man?

Mr. SPILLERS. Surely.

Mr. JENNINGS. How about the national forester there? He has his timber management specialist in his office and I realize that he is dealing primarily with Federal forest lands. Is there coordination between those two?

Mr. SPILLERS. There is coordination at the Federal level through the State forester. The State foresters are in charge of the farm foresters. The National Forest Service man who may be there is in charge of national forest property there.

Mr. JENNINGS. That is right; but what coordination goes on between these two? Do you have a liaison officer between them?

Mr. SPILLERS. Of course, if they are in the same area they are closely alined. They know each other and work together. In our own State of Virginia, of which I am a resident, we have a wonderful State forester there in George Dean.

Mr. JENNINGS. I agree.

Mr. SPILLERS. He has an organization of district foresters and these farm foresters work under his district foresters.

In the State of Virginia, for example, we have two forest supervisors; one at George Washington National Forest and one at Jefferson. I know both of them very well and I know they cooperate fully with George Dean and his State forestry organization.

If there is a matter of a fire, they cooperate in putting the fire out.

In my opinion, and I get around quite a bit——

Mr. JENNINGS. What could you expect as an individual farmer managing a forest?

Mr. SPILLERS. If you have a tract of forest land in the State of Virginia and you want help on it, I would suggest you get in touch with George Dean and ask that one of his men visit you and walk over your property with you.

Mr. JENNINGS. I have and they did a fine job.

Mr. SPILLERS. And make a plan of that.

Then I would suggest you follow that plan closely and if you have any timber for sale, I would suggest you call them and ask them to help you mark the timber for sale and make a sale of it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. JENNINGS. They did just that.

Mr. SPILLERS. Were you not pleased with their assistance?

Mr. JENNINGS. Very well pleased, but is there any coordination between that group and the national——

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is a question I wanted to bring out. It seems to me you have two entirely different categories here; the National Forest Service is supposed to work in the national forests and they are concerned with stands of trees and concerned with the cutting of timber to see that the counties get a proper proportion of the revenues. They are supposed to deal with problems of fire in the national forests and insofar as any kind of coordinated activity is concerned they just operate in different areas, do they not?



Mr. SPILLERS. Thank you, Mr. Matthews. That is right, just like we do in Florida and in Virginia; but I would want to answer Mr. Jennings' question:

There is coordination. We are all working in this national program of forestry, Mr. Jennings.

Mr. JENNINGS. Why should we, at the Federal Government level, give 50 percent of the money for the State of Virginia? Why should not they give 50 percent to manage our national forests in Virginia? They are located in the State of Virginia and they are getting revenue from that source. Why should we not ask them to give 50 percent toward national forests? It would make just as much sense as to pay one-half of Bill Curnutt's salary as it would to pay half of George Dean's salary.

Mr. SPILLERS. May I answer your first question first, Mr. Jennings, about why we should pay 50 percent of this cooperative program: That is the program for which I am personally responsible. I think in the national interest, we should pay up to 50 percent of the cooperative forestry work with the States because we want it to be a national program.

Mr. JENNINGS. You have no control over it, do you?

Mr. SPILLERS. Yes, we do.

Mr. JENNINGS. You do?

Mr. SPILLERS. Absolutely.

Mr. JENNINGS. It is not completely a State program if we exercise any control. We just set up some guidelines.

Suppose we did not have a good cooperative man like George Dean? What could we do to change it?

Mr. SPILLERS. The first thing I would do would be to build up a good cooperative man like George Dean. Take the positive approach. We work with these State foresters over the years and we are mighty proud of them. I do not know of a one who would not cooperate with us.

Incidentally, in this program now we have only one State left out of that program and that is Arizona.

Mr. JENNINGS. I am surprised they have not come in with this 50 percent incentive.

Mr. SPILLERS. They have very little forest. You see, in the last few years, they brought in Alaska and Hawaii and even Wyoming. So we think we are on the right track with this cooperative program. We are very proud of it.

Mr. JENNINGS. What is the answer to the second question? Let us assume you are on the right track and have all good men like George Dean. Why should not the State pay half of Bill Curnutt's salary in the national forest? If we have an obligation to pay half of the State's program, why should not they pay half of the Federal program costs because it is in their State? It is within the borderline and we pay a certain amount of the bills and we build Forest Service roads and build up tourists attractions and so forth.

Do they not have some obligation to come in and assist on a cooperative basis? Is this a one-way street or should it be?

Mr. SPILLERS. Mr. Jennings, I am not in charge of the national forests but I would like to say that the two were set up under entirely different legislation.

Of course, they have different rules and regulations to guide them and I do think we have a great deal of cooperation with the national forests from the people of my State of Virginia. I do think we have a great deal of interest in the local people and the national forests.

Of course, the funds for the national forests all come from the Federal Government but the money that is earned by those national forests, in Virginia, a considerable amount of that goes to the State.

Mr. McINTIRE. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. Yes.

Mr. McINTIRE. Twenty-five percent by counties?

Mr. SPILLERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. GRANT. In effect, this is getting down to the individual tree-grower, the individual farmer and you might be dealing in the national forests with a county or State. However, you are not dealing with individuals?

Mr. SPILLERS. That is what this cooperative program is aimed at, yes, sir, to get to the individual farmer with a man out there on the ground working under the State forester.

Mr. JENNINGS. This cooperative program boils down to this: In connection with the Federal Government and the State Government, it is a 50-50 proposition on things that pertain to the individuals of the States and the State government, and the things that pertain to the Federal Government and the State on a national basis it is 100 percent Federal Government and zero State government. The proceeds, or results, from the first, from the State local, and then 100 percent to the individuals and the proceeds from the Federal portion for Federal funds are 75 percent Federal and 25 percent State. That is the street we are traveling on this cooperative basis, is it? In other words, once we pay 50-50, we say, "You take all of the benefits except from the overall national benefits, which we will agree are considered, and now the benefits derived from the 100 percent proposition, the Federal Government pays 100 percent on it and we will take 75 percent and give you 25 percent because it is located within your State."

Is that correct?

Mr. SPILLERS. I am not sure I understand your question.

Mr. JENNINGS. We pay 50 percent of the cooperative activity on a State level, the Federal Government does?

Mr. SPILLERS. The Federal Government pays 50 percent; yes, sir.

Mr. JENNINGS. You sell timber as a result of that but what does the Federal Government get in return for the sale?

Mr. SPILLERS. I would say it gets a contribution to the national welfare. It gets a contribution to prosperity.

Mr. JENNINGS. Economic development?

Mr. SPILLERS. Contribution to preparation in the event of war; it gets employment; it gets many things. Of course, it gets no money back immediately except maybe through taxation.

Mr. JENNINGS. If we sell property on the national forests, managed by and paid for 100 percent by the Federal Government, what do the States get and what does the Federal Government get?

Mr. SPILLERS. The local counties get 25 percent of the gross sales in lieu of taxes.

Mr. JENNINGS. The Federal Government gets 75 percent?

Mr. SPILLERS. Right.



MR. JENNINGS. That is the question I asked. Is that not the street we are traveling?

MR. SPILLERS. That is the situation as I understand it; yes, sir.

MR. JENNINGS. That is right; and that is the point I wanted to understand. That is the way I understand it.

This bill is asking, according to you, for an open-end appropriation and knocking out the \$2.5 million that is now authorized?

MR. SPILLERS. Yes, sir.

MR. JENNINGS. You want unlimited authorization?

MR. SPILLERS. Yes, sir; right.

MR. JENNINGS. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

MR. GRANT. Thank you very much, Mr. Spillers, for your contribution.

MR. SPILLERS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee.

MR. GRANT. I believe we will have time to hear one other witness.

Mr. Wilkins, proceed.

#### STATEMENT OF AUSTIN H. WILKINS, FOREST COMMISSIONER OF MAINE

MR. WILKINS. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I would like to present this statement for the record.

MR. GRANT. Without objection, it will be filed in the record.

(The statement of Mr. Wilkins follows:)

#### STATEMENT OF AUSTIN H. WILKINS, FOREST COMMISSIONER OF MAINE

Gentlemen, my name is Austin H. Wilkins, forest commissioner of Maine, and currently serving as chairman of the legislative committee of the Association of State Foresters. I appreciate the opportunity to appear as a witness before this committee and to speak favorably on H.R. 9728, an amendment to increase the authorization for cooperative forest management from \$2,500,000 to \$5 million. This measure was introduced by Congressman George M. Grant, of Alabama. A companion bill, H.R. 9953, was also introduced by Congressman Clifford G. McIntire, of Maine. Mindful of your busy schedule, I shall be brief and only highlight pertinent points in my presentation.

The Association of State Foresters, which I represent today, strongly urges your consideration of the recommended authorization increases. We are most appreciative that the present full authorization of \$2,500,000 appears in the 1963 Budget Bureau Report and accepted by the House and Senate Appropriations Committees but awaiting final action by the committee of conference.

The following background should be helpful in your deliberations. The Cooperative Forest Management Act of 1950 provided for 50-50 Federal matching funds with State expenditures for technical assistance to small woodland owners. This is considered by all State foresters as important forestry legislation. Attached is a supplemental sheet showing Federal allotments and State expenditures during the period 1951-52. It is to be noted that State and private expenditures are in a ratio of nearly 2 to 1 of Federal funds.

Three-fourths of the 435 million acres of State and private forest lands in the Nation is held by nearly 4½ million small woodland owners. Of these, 3½ million are farmers with an average of 49 acres per farmer. One-half of all the privately owned commercial forest land is in private ownership. It is these small holdings where technical assistance is badly needed to help make these poorly managed areas more productive. This is where the future "woodpile" of tomorrow is to be found. Added to this serious problem is the forest land shrinkage brought about through encroachment of urban expansion; road, highway, and airport construction; new reservoirs; power and pipe line construction; etc. Approximately 1 million acres are retired annually through these encroachments.

During the period of 1950-62, within the present \$2,500,000 authorization, much has been accomplished by the States throughout the country. Cumulative figures show 573,000 requests for assistance with 33,321,000 acres involved, 1,800,000 acres harvested, \$105,534,000 of stumpage return to owners, \$125,134,000 return to farmers for chopping, yardage, etc., and 29,000 forest product operators assisted. These are significant accomplishment figures under this cooperative forest management program. The individual States which you gentlemen represent have greatly benefited.

The Chief of the Forest Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture shows the following 1961 accomplishments in his annual report: 89,254 woodland owners assisted, 4,313,000 acres of woodland treated, 495,325,000 board feet of forest products harvested, and \$12 million gross sale value.

May I be pardoned for using my own State of Maine for the following examples: We have a landownership pattern of many thousands of small woodland owners, with forest products from their holdings contributing nearly 50 percent of the annual harvest. The aggregate acreage is about 6 million acres, or nearly one-third of the forested area of the State. Interest is high in this work program and continues to increase each year. This is equally true with other States of the country.

The second Maine example is the forest unit productivity project study in cooperation with the Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Using four contiguous towns, it is hoped that a pattern may be developed for better small woodland management for other States to use. A copy of the brochure is attached.

In conclusion there is a need for an increase in the authorization from \$2,500,000 to \$5 million to step up the small woodland management program to meet the projected timber and forest product needs by 1975 and the year 2000.

The needs of timber and forest products must necessarily come in large measure from the small privately owned woodlands. These areas are accessible and potentially the most productive.

The services provided by the additional money requested under this legislation will greatly enhance the quality and quantity of forest growth and contribute immensely to the forest economy and all other multiple uses in the Nation.

The Budget Bureau has no objection to this proposed legislation.

The Association of State Foresters urges your support of the amendment of H.R. 9728 and H.R. 9953.

Thank you for the privilege of appearing before your committee.

#### FEDERAL AND STATE EXPENDITURES

#### *Cooperative forest management, Cooperative Forest Management Act of 1950*

[Dollars in thousands]

| Fiscal year             | Federal allocation to States <sup>1</sup> | State and private | Total   | State and private expenditures of multiple of Federal funds | Fiscal year | Federal allocation to States <sup>1</sup> | State and private | Total   | State and private expenditures of multiple of Federal funds |
|-------------------------|---|-------------------|---------|---|-------------|---|-------------------|---------|---|
| 1962 <sup>2</sup> ----- | \$2,284                                   | \$3,680           | \$5,964 | 1.6   | 1956-----   | \$572                                     | \$1,432           | \$2,004 | 2.5   |
| 1961-----               | 1,354                                     | 2,941             | 4,295   | 2.2   | 1955-----   | 534                                       | 1,386             | 1,920   | 2.6   |
| 1960-----               | 1,371                                     | 2,484             | 3,855   | 1.8   | 1954-----   | 537                                       | 1,228             | 1,765   | 2.3   |
| 1959-----               | 1,353                                     | 2,391             | 3,744   | 1.8   | 1953-----   | 540                                       | 1,176             | 1,716   | 2.2   |
| 1958-----               | 1,329                                     | 1,750             | 3,079   | 1.3   | 1952-----   | 537                                       | 986               | 1,523   | 1.8   |
| 1957-----               | 866                                       | 1,503             | 2,369   | 1.7   | 1951-----   | 549                                       | 886               | 1,435   | 1.6   |

<sup>1</sup> These allocations do not reflect the total Federal appropriation. Funds are withheld for administrative purposes.

<sup>2</sup> Estimate.

Mr. GRANT. In answer to the question that the forest rangers are in the employment of the Federal Government and can look after that, large paper companies and mills are financially able to employ foresters to look after their timber growth.

This is legislation that applies to the small man, to the small farmer who is not financially able to employ a man and could not with his limited acreage employ a forester himself?



Mr. WILKINS. That is correct.

Mr. GRANT. I understand that that is the crux of this whole matter.

Mr. WILKINS. In my State we have 77,000 individual forest land owners of which 76,000 are small owners. The other 1,000 own pretty nearly 12 million acres of forest land. They do employ their own industrial foresters.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. GRANT. Yes, sir.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Is it not true that some of these large companies send men out to work with individual farmers to increase their production so as to insure their future?

Mr. GRANT. I think they do.

Mr. WILKINS. They do through the tree farm market family program. I think this is not in conflict with your woodland management program, to encourage production and feed wood through these mills. They have a tremendous farm family program.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. I know they do down home because they used to call on me and offer this assistance long before I got to Congress.

Mr. WILKINS. Mr. Jennings, I would like to say that in my State there are 50,000 acres of national forest from which we receive the benefit in the way of a 25-percent return. This is a very token figure. I would say it would not exceed, in any 1 year, three or four thousand, but it is plowed back into the small towns for schools and roads.

We do allocate and prorate this among the seven or eight towns.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, let me ask this question: Are you finding any encroachment on your rights by these people from private industry in trying to get these farmers assistance? Do you feel there is any encroachment there?

Mr. WILKINS. Not a bit. We are a very happy family.

Mr. JENNINGS. Improving everything?

Mr. WILKINS. That is right. They are taking part of the overload of these requests we cannot currently afford to handle under the present setup.

Mr. JENNINGS. What are you getting in return for this service you are rendering to these people?

Mr. WILKINS. Speaking for the State?

Mr. JENNINGS. Yes.

Mr. WILKINS. As State forester, we feel, as Mr. Spillers indicated, we are improving the economy of Maine.

We are providing employment and various other aspects of the economy of the area.

My main concern is that we have 6 million acres of presently poorly managed area.

Mr. JENNINGS. What type of State laws do you have that provide for the harvesting of these acres?

Mr. WILKINS. There is no particular statute.

Mr. JENNINGS. Do you feel there should be?

Mr. WILKINS. We think that under the present setup, through the cooperative setup, we, in carrying out a management program, have selected cutting and we have done, we feel, a very creditable job in selling the farmer the idea that by selective cutting and proper management, he is going to insure a residual stand after each cutting that later on he can come in there and make another harvest.

Mr. JENNINGS. But he may under your State law cut everything that will make a 2 by 4 if he wants to. He can just have mass cutting.

Mr. WILKINS. That is right. It is an educational program to encourage him in the long run.

Mr. JENNINGS. You have no laws at all. After giving this service, 50 percent furnished by the State, 50 percent furnished by the Federal Government, you have no control over him mismanaging and misusing it completely?

Mr. WILKINS. We have no regulatory laws that govern the man, how he shall or shall not cut.

Mr. JENNINGS. Have you asked the State legislature? First, do you feel there should be some laws in the protection of the national interest?

Mr. WILKINS. In my opinion and experience, Mr. Jennings, the answer is we have been so successful in the last 10 years in convincing people that selective cutting management on their own basis is most encouraging. Take for example, the International Paper Co. and the Great Northern Paper Co., large holdings in Maine, are managing their lands voluntarily on the selective management basis.

Mr. JENNINGS. That is the large companies that the chairman and Mr. Hagan were talking about. They are doing that. Do you feel that you need any State laws that will carry out the recommended management practices that you have?

Mr. WILKINS. Not at the present moment. As I say, the last 10 years—

Mr. JENNINGS. So you do not need additional men for educational purposes out of this \$2,500,000 to increase that to an open end \$5 million? You do not feel you need any of that to encourage properly carrying out these practices?

Mr. WILKINS. Yes. We need the money for—

Mr. JENNINGS. But you do not need any laws?

Mr. WILKINS. I think the way it is set up is very satisfactory, on a voluntary basis.

Mr. JENNINGS. I would have to say I disagree with you on that because after the Federal Government furnishing 50 percent of the money and the State furnishing 50 percent, trying to get these people to put in these practices, assist them in making the recommendations, then the only thing you have is the power of suggestion and education and persuasion to prevent them practicing something that is not in the interest of the State program or the Federal program.

Don't you feel that in some cases where we cooperate on this basis that anything below 8 inches should not be cut, or certainly 6 inches or somewhere down the line; that is, for sawtimber, unless it is going to make pulpwood? That could be cut whenever it is the best.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. Yes.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. What are you going to do when a man is about to lose his little farm and a man comes along and tells him, "If you will let me cut it clean, that will pay off the mortgage." How are you going to pass a law to tell this man he cannot clean his whole forest if he wants to?

Mr. JENNINGS. That is where cooperation comes in and we bring in these other loans of Government—Farm Home Administration, Conservation and Extension Service, Vocational Agriculture, ASC,



Area Redevelopment, Rural Redevelopment, Home Demonstration Agency and the others come in. The forester comes in to educate him and persuade him that he should not do that.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Then that will keep him from doing it?

Mr. JENNINGS. To prolong it, not necessarily to tide him over. I definitely feel the States have failed in this responsibility in this field. I feel they have not accepted their responsibilities in this field and maybe this is a good opportunity to help them correct their errors. If we offer this 50 percent to them in order to get them to put up the other 50 percent, maybe we could say, "You should pass State laws that will not permit indiscriminate cutting." I think you will agree that that is certainly a good practice and yet we do not have anything in the way of laws that gives us a return on our investment. Apparently you do not advocate anything.

Mr. McINTIRE. Will you yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. Yes.

Mr. McINTIRE. I think the gentleman is getting over into an area——

Mr. JENNINGS. Of States rights.

Mr. McINTIRE. I was not going to come to that, but getting into an area which is probably an interesting exercise in——

Mr. JENNINGS. Futility.

Mr. McINTIRE. Discussion of responsibilities in the public interest. But I do think you cannot overlook the fact that in getting into this area you are running right straight into the property rights of an individual. Shall we accept the principle of zoning every acre of land in the United States and then making the management of those acres comply with the zoning?

Surely in urban areas we generally accept the idea of zoning as being in the public interest, but if your idea is developed to its ultimate application, it might arrive to the point where a county agent is the responsible person in each county to tell each individual landowner in a farming community what crops he can plant and just where his rose shall grow. I think we have not come to that point yet, and I will lay my bets on the side of the inherent characteristics of American people and their education process that better management and utilization can come about. I think this program is directed on that principle. Too, anyone can go out here and clean cut his woodlands if he chooses to. Denying him the right is a step we have not taken yet, with the exception of those crops which are managed under price stabilization programs, which is another issue entirely; however, outside of that field we still accept the idea that the right to own property in this country is a right inherent in the Constitution subject to some regulations like zoning in urban and metropolitan areas. But we have some rights as to how these acreages shall be managed.

As I say, the point which you raise is an interesting exercise for discussion, but I think if you propose doing anything you have to get back to the basic principle and consider what are to be the tenets and inherent rights of private ownership. This may be to the detriment of public interest in the opinion of someone who does not own the property, but again you have to get back to what are the rights of a property holder. I do not think just because we have an agricultural county agent who may be associated with a program of assistance from

State, Federal, and county sources, and who may be a specialist in marketing, I do not think that the principle should carry through to the proposition that if a person wanted to market a dozen eggs he would have to ask the county agent for permission to do it. I think this is another step which is not inherent in the right of property ownership in this country. There are minor exceptions; that is, particular programs which we worked on a lot in this committee relating to production management, in the interest of income stabilization. The other exceptions are the planned patterns of urban and metropolitan development.

Mr. JENNINGS. Is the gentleman through?

Mr. McINTIRE. Yes. I do not expect to revise the record on that point.

Mr. JENNINGS. Let me just make this comment on his point: Certainly if you would carry it on to the point that he was talking about, it would be rather far fetched, but I see nothing wrong with this being a voluntary program and the voluntary part should come at the time they accept the service in the beginning rather than after the fact. It is not something new in agriculture. You are doing it in the conservation program. You agree at the time you get Federal aid to build a farm pond that you are going to build it in such a manner and use it in such a way as it will benefit not only the farmer, but the moneys will be wisely expended. You are entering into a contract at the beginning in which you agree that you will do certain things. You enter into a contract on conservation, on diverted acres, on the soil bank, on the acreage reserve program, and I just contend that this is something that should be voluntary but when the man volunteers to go into the program he should volunteer that he is going to carry out the program and give something in return for the moneys that are expended. It should be a contractual obligation on both parts, that you are going to make a contract with the man and say, "We will provide you with what we say we will provide in the way of services and in return you are voluntarily accepting that contract to do certain things including proper cutting and management.

"You are going to do something in return. You are going to manage these lands in such a manner as to give the public, who is providing the moneys for these managements, a certain remuneration for the services involved."

It is a voluntary cooperation. It is not encroaching upon individual liberties and property rights. It is, I repeat, on a voluntary contractual relationship. That is what I say should be done. I think these States certainly should pass some legislation that would provide for the benefits of the taxpaying public that are giving the moneys for these programs. I do not think we have any in my own State of Virginia. I think after George Dean and his associates go out there and help these people, if they want to, they can just, denude the property and start back again with the assistance of your management.

I want to reiterate that I think from the national standpoint, from the National Forest Service and from the State forest service, that this is probably the best program of cooperation we could possibly point to. Not for a minute do I want to leave the impression that I am opposed to this Federal-State cooperation. I just want it to be a little more of a two-way rather than a one-way street. I think it is



needed badly in all the States. I still think the State should accept some responsibility. I believe if you can get the State forester off to one side to talk to you, you will agree to it privately, whether you agree to it publicly or not.

Mr. GRANT. I will say to the witness that is a pretty long question. I do not believe we will have the time to have an answer.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. I certainly do not want to take any more time but in connection with what the gentleman from Virginia has said, I think what he is advocating will in time probably come after the agencies, as represented here, do a wonderful job similar to what they have done in the past in a number of instances, and I think of the forest fires, for instance. I can remember when it was a common practice to burn woods, your own woods and everyone else's woods. I can remember these Government men putting it on movies and everything. They finally educated our people to the fact that it was stupid on their part to burn woods and finally you have seen it come around to where it is against the State laws to burn woods.

Mr. JENNINGS. That is not encroachment on individual property rights, to prevent a man from burning his forest, is it?

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. By the same token, he ought to have the right to burn off what he wants to but he has been educated because of the plugging that these boys have done until he finally became educated to the fact that that was a terrible thing for the general economy.

(The following statement was also submitted to the subcommittee:)

STATEMENT OF HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM  
THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak for a moment in favor of the bills which you now have under consideration, H.R. 9728 and H.R. 9953, which would provide some much needed amendments to our cooperative Forest Management Act.

In California we have some fine national forests and we also have some excellent State and private woodland. In fact, in California about half of the woodland is State and private. This is one of our most valuable resources and we are anxious to do everything possible to increase its contribution to the local economy.

The importance of the private timberlands to our natural resource program was stressed most effectively March 1 of this year by President Kennedy in his conservation message to the Congress. I would like to quote this message.

"For an effective national timber resources conservation effort, however, we must depend upon the quarter-billion acres of private timberlands, consisting primarily of small tracts in more than 4 million ownerships.

"Improved timber management practice on these small tracts is difficult because of such problems as nonresident ownership, short tenure, owner's lack of knowledge or interest in forestry, limited economic incentives, and the inefficient size of forest units. Existing technical and financial assistance programs have proven inadequate, and I have therefore directed the Secretary of Agriculture to intensify the efforts of his Department to develop a program for improving the management of these small forests."

One of the best ways to improve this resource is to provide the technical assistance to small woodland owners and timber processors which is made possible by the Cooperative Forest Management Act of 1950. This act, as you know, provides for a cooperative agreement between the State forest service and the Federal Forest Service. The States administer the program while the Forest Service provides financial aid, appropriate inspections, and assists in training and the development of new techniques. The States employ the farm or service foresters who are the men on the ground working with the small woodland owners and loggers in forest management and utilization.

Nationwide, I have been told, we have a big problem in trying to reach 4½ million small woodland owners. While these small woodland owners—three-

fourths of whom are farmers—individually have only relatively small tracts, in the aggregate they add up to some 265 million acres—more than three times the commercial forest land in our national forests. From a national standpoint I submit this is an important segment of our valuable forest resources.

In California this year the State put up \$67,493 and the Federal Government contributed \$39,700. We wish that we could be matched 50-50 as intended by the act, but there wasn't enough Federal money. For 2 years now the Forest Service has been operating at the maximum authorized by the act, \$2½ million. The bills which you are considering would make it possible for the Congress to provide up to \$5 million which would, of course, help the Forest Service match the States, and result in more assistance to small woodland owners.

Looking into the record I find that when legislation was considered in 1949 as a replacement for the old Norris-Doxey Act, a total of 28 different bills were introduced, there were 27 personal appearances by Congressmen and Senators—both Democrats and Republicans—and there were 58 statements in favor of those bills. My only point in mentioning this is that farm forestry has always been a bipartisan activity. I commend you for considering doubling the authorization for Federal appropriations for this worthwhile activity. We have only 10 farm foresters in the State of California and about 650 through the Nation but we hope within the next year or two we can at least double the numbers of these helpful technicians. Your favorable consideration of these bills is the first step in this direction.

Gentlemen, I thank you for your consideration.

MR. GRANT. There is a quorum call. Thank you so much.

I believe this takes care of the testimony on H.R. 9728 and related bills. Tomorrow we have four more bills. We hoped we might continue today, but we will have to postpone that until tomorrow. The committee will adjourn until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 12:20 p.m., the committee adjourned to reconvene at 10 a.m., Wednesday, July 25, 1962.)



LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 87-680

H. R. 9728

TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Index and summary of H. R. 9728 . . . . . | .1 |
| Digest of Public Law 87-680 . . . . .     | .2 |



## INDEX AND SUMMARY OF H. R. 9728

|                |   |
|----------------|---|
| Jan. 18, 1962  | Rep. Grant introduced H. R. 9728 which was referred to the House Agriculture Committee. Print of bill as introduced.    |
| Jan. 30, 1962  | Rep. McIntire introduced H. R. 9953 which was referred to the House Agriculture Committee. Print of bill as introduced. |
| July 27, 1962  | House committee voted to report H. R. 9728.   |
| July 30, 1962  | House committee reported H. R. 9728 without amendment. H. Report No. 2067. Print of bill and report.                    |
| Aug. 6, 1962   | House passed H. R. 9728 under suspension of the rules.  |
| Sept. 5, 1962  | Senate committee voted to report H. R. 9728.  |
| Sept. 7, 1962  | Senate committee reported H. R. 9728 without amendment. S. Report No. 2012. Print of bill and report.                   |
| Sept. 12, 1962 | Senate passed H. R. 9728 without amendment.   |
| Sept. 25, 1962 | Approved: Public Law 87-680.  |





DIGEST OF PUBLIC LAW 87-680

AMENDMENT TO COOPERATIVE FOREST MANAGEMENT ACT. Amends the Cooperative Forest Management Act by increasing from \$2,500,000 to \$5,000,000, the sum authorized to be appropriated annually to provide Federal participation in a cooperative program with the States under which technical assistance is furnished to small forest and woodlot owners, small sawmill operators, and other processors of primary forest products.









87TH CONGRESS  
2D SESSION

# H. R. 9728

---

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 18, 1962

Mr. GRANT introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

---

## A BILL

To amend the Cooperative Forest Management Act.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3       That the Cooperative Forest Management Act (64 Stat.  
4       473; 16 U.S.C. 568c, 568d) is amended by striking out of  
5       the first sentence of section 2 thereof “\$2,500,000” and  
6       inserting “\$5,000,000”.

I

8<sup>TH</sup> CONGRESS  
2<sup>D</sup> SESSION

H. R. 9728

---

---

## A BILL

To amend the Cooperative Forest Management  
Act.

---

---

By Mr. GRANT

JANUARY 18, 1962

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture







87<sup>TH</sup> CONGRESS  
2<sup>D</sup> SESSION

# H. R. 9953

---

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 30, 1962

MR. MCINTIRE introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

---

## A BILL

To amend the Cooperative Forest Management Act.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3       That the Cooperative Forest Management Act (64 Stat. 473;  
4       16 U.S.C. 568c, 568d) is amended by striking out in the first  
5       sentence of section 2 thereof “\$2,500,000” and inserting  
6       “\$5,000,000”.

I



87<sup>TH</sup> CONGRESS  
2D SESSION

**H. R. 9953**

---

# **A BILL**

To amend the Cooperative Forest Management  
Act.

---

By Mr. McINTIRE

---

JANUARY 30, 1962

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture







July 27, 1962

"Title III (Subtitle B)---Wheat Program"

"A marketing certificate plan under which noncertificated wheat would be supported at a level determined after consideration of its feed value and world price, and certificated wheat would be supported at between 65 and 90 percent of parity. Certificates would be issued to producers for all wheat consumed domestically for food and such part of the exports as determined by the Secretary would carry out the price and income objectives of the bill.

"Title IV---Credit"

"1. Farmers Home Administration loans for recreational facilities and sewers.

"2. An increase (from \$10 million to \$25 million) in the amount of direct FHA real estate loans for immediate resale which can be made from the agricultural credit insurance fund.

"3. A single loan fund for Rural Electrification Administration loans, to include funds appropriated, borrowed, or repaid, and to be available for loans only as authorized in appropriation acts.

"Title V---Industrial Uses of Agricultural Products"

"Establishes an Agricultural Research and Industrial Use Administration within the Department of Agriculture to coordinate and expedite an expanded research program on industrial uses of agricultural commodities."

HOUSE

12. FORESTRY. The agriculture Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 12688 (amended), to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage and assist the States in carrying on a program of forestry research; H. R. 9728, to amend the Cooperative Forest Management Act to increase the appropriation authorization from \$2.5 million to \$5 million; S. 3064 (amended), to increase the authorization for the national survey of forest resources; S. 3112 (amended), to add certain lands to the Pike National Forest in Colo. and the Carson and Santa Fe National Forests in N. M.; and H. R. 7195 (amended), to add certain lands to the Wasatch National Forest, Utah. The Subcommittee on Forests of the Agriculture Committee voted to report to the full committee H. R. 11111, authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to sell and convey certain forest lands in Iowa. p. D646
13. EXTENSION WORK; RESEARCH. The Agriculture Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 12589, to amend the Smith-Lever Act so as to revise the formula for apportioning funds among the States, and H. R. 12568 (a clean bill to be introduced), to assist States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations. p. D646
14. APPROPRIATIONS. Received (during adjournment of the House) the conference report on H. R. 10802, the Department of Interior and related agencies, including Forest Service, appropriation bill for 1963 (H. Rept. 2049) (pp. 13968-70). At the end of this Digest is a table showing the action of the conferees on Forest Service items.
- The Appropriations Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) the independent offices appropriation bill for 1963. p. D647

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

15. PERSONNEL. Extension of remarks of Sen. Mundt criticizing the increase in the number of Federal employees, and inserting an article, "The Federal Diary--New Policy Aims at More Output Per U. S. Employee." p. A5796

16. BUDGETING. Extension of remarks of Sen. Byrd inserting a resolution by the Virginia Bankers Association urging a reduction of Federal expenditures. p.A5797
17. RECLAMATION. Speech in the House of Rep. Aspinall supporting the Mann Creek Federal Reclamation Project, Idaho. p. A5802  
Speech in the House of Rep. Saylor opposing the Mann Creek Federal Reclamation Project, Idaho. pp. A5804-5

BILLS INTRODUCED

18. WHEAT. S. 3574 by Sen. Ellender (by request), to extend the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee.
19. WATER RESOURCES. S. 3579, by Sen. Anderson, to establish water resources research institutes at land-grant colleges and State universities, and to promote a more adequate national program of water research; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. Remarks of author, pp. 13961-5

0

COMMITTEE HEARINGS JULY 30:

Marketing orders for potatoes, H. Agriculture (Hedlund, AMS, to testify).  
Wilderness preservation bill, H. Interior (exec).  
Foreign trade bill, S. Finance.  
Indirect costs in research grants, H. Science and Astronautics.  
Federal pay bill, S. Civil Service.  
Foreign aid appropriations, H. Appropriations (exec).  
Travel by Government employees on U. S. air carriers, S. Commerce.

oOo







# Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF  
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only;  
should not be quoted  
or cited)

Issued July 31, 1962  
For actions of July 28 & 30, 1962  
87th-2d, Nos.  
130 & 131

## CONTENTS

|                            |                       |                         |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| Adjournment.....16         | Farm housing.....6    | Information.....23      |
| Appropriations.....1,2,25  | Farm program.....12   | Lands.....3,10          |
| Civil defense.....2        | Food additives.....22 | Life insurance.....26   |
| Communications.....15,17   | Food for peace.....18 | Loans.....7,29          |
| Education.....11           | Foreign affairs.....8 | Meatpackers.....29      |
| Electrification.....20     | Forest Service.....1  | Mineral leases.....27   |
| Employment.....24          | Forestry.....3,30     | Mining.....5            |
| Experiment stations.....21 | Health benefits.....9 | Nominations.....31      |
| Extension work.....4,21    | Housing.....6         | Oyster loans.....7,29   |
|                            |                       | Patents.....32          |
|                            |                       | Peace Corps.....13      |
|                            |                       | Personnel.....9,24,26   |
|                            |                       | Property.....23         |
|                            |                       | Public facilities.....7 |
|                            |                       | Research.....2,3,21     |
|                            |                       | Small business.....19   |
|                            |                       | Transportation.....28   |
|                            |                       | Water pollution.....14  |
|                            |                       | Weather.....32          |

**HIGHLIGHTS:** House agreed to conference report on Interior appropriation bill. House began debate on independent offices appropriation bill. Rep. Fountain defended his subcommittee's action in Estes case. House committee reported bills for expansion of survey of forest resources, to aid States in forestry research, increase authorization under Cooperative Forest Management Act, provide additional research facilities for experiment stations, revise distribution formula for extension funds, and add certain lands to national forests. House committee reported bill for housing for elderly in rural areas.

## HOUSE - July 30

1. INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963. Agreed to the Conference report on this bill, H. R. 10802, and acted on the amendment in disagreement (relating to Indian claims) (pp. 13975-7). See Digest 129 for a summary of Forest Service items.
2. INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963. Began and concluded general debate on this bill, H. R. 12711 (pp. 13980-14019). This bill was reported by the Appropriations Committee on July 27, during adjournment of the House (H. Rept. 2050) (p. 14030). Agreed to an amendment by Rep. Miller, Calif., to provide that none of the funds shall be used to pay any recipient of a grant for the conduct of a research project an amount for indirect expenses in connection with the project in excess of 25 percent of the direct costs (the bill as reported provided a limitation of 20 percent) (p. 14014-18). The bill includes funds for the Office of Emergency Planning (including civil defense and defense

mobilization functions of Federal agencies), Office of Science and Technology, Civil Service Commission, Federal Trade Commission, General Accounting Office, General Services Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Interstate Commerce Commission, National Science Foundation, and Veterans Administration.

3. FORESTRY. The Agriculture Committee reported the following bills:  
~~S. 3064, with amendment, to increase the authorization for the national survey of forest resources (H. Rept. 2063);~~  
~~S. 3112, with amendment, to add certain lands to the Pike National Forest in Colo. and the Carson and Santa Fe National Forests in N. M. (H. Rept. 2064);~~  
~~H. R. 12688, with amendment, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage and assist the States in carrying on a program of forestry research (H. Rept. 2065);~~  
~~H. R. 7195, with amendment, to add certain lands to the Wasatch National Forest, Utah (H. Rept. 2066);~~  
H. R. 9728, without amendment, to amend the Cooperative Forest Management Act to increase the appropriation authorization from \$2.5 million to \$5 million (H. Rept. 2067). p. 10430
4. EXTENSION WORK. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment H. R. 12589, to amend the Smith-Lever Act so as to revise the formula for apportioning funds among the States (H. Rept. 2068). p. 14030
5. MINING. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendment H. R. 9280, to amend Sec. 2 of the Materials Act (H. Rept. 2055); H. R. 10540, to exclude deposits of petrified wood from appropriation under the U. S. mining laws (H. Rept. 2056); and H. R. 11049, to provide for the relief of certain oil and gas lessees under the Mineral Leasing Act (H. Rept. 2057). p. 14030
6. HOUSING. The Banking and Currency Committee reported on July 28 (during adjournment of the House) with amendment H. R. 12628, to authorize a program of housing for the elderly in rural areas (H. Rept. 2052). p. 14030
7. LOANS. Concurred in the Senate amendments to H. R. 7336, to promote the production of oysters by propagation of disease-resistant strains. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 13975  
The Banking and Currency Committee reported on July 28 (during adjournment of the House) with amendment S. 3327, to make certain federally impacted areas eligible for assistance under the public facility loan program (H. Rept. 2051) p. 13975
8. FOREIGN AFFAIRS. The Foreign Affairs Committee issued a report pertaining to a center for culture and technical interchange between East and West (H. Rept. 2060). p. 14030
9. PERSONNEL. Received from the Civil Service Commission a proposed bill "to amend the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act with respect to Government contribution for expenses incurred in the administration of such act"; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee. p. 14030
10. PUBLIC LANDS. The Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report to the full committee with amendment H. R. 11266, to amend the act of March 8, 1922, to extend its provisions to the townsite laws applicable in Alaska. p. D654
11. EDUCATION. Rep. Green, Ore., urged the conferees to agree to file a conference report on H. R. 8900, the proposed College Academic Facilities and Scholarship Act. pp. 14021-2



## AMENDING THE COOPERATIVE FOREST MANAGEMENT ACT

---

JULY 30, 1962.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

Mr. COOLEY, from the Committee on Agriculture, submitted the following

### REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 9728]

The Committee on Agriculture, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 9728) to amend the Cooperative Forest Management Act, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

#### PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to authorize an increase from \$2.5 million to \$5 million in appropriations for Federal participation in the Cooperative Forest Management Act. This is the authority under which technical assistance is made available to small forest and woodland owners. Although Federal funds are made available only on a 50-50 matching basis, State and private expenditures for the program have been exceeding Federal expenditures at a ratio of approximately 2 to 1.

#### NEED

Three-fourths of the 435 million acres of State and private forest lands in the United States are held by nearly 4.5 million small woodland owners. Of these, 3.5 million are farmers with an average of 49 acres per farm. One-half of all the privately owned commercial forest land is in private ownership. It is these small holdings which comprise the "woodpile" of tomorrow and where technical assistance is badly needed to make poorly managed areas more productive.

This is the only forestry program designed specifically to assist these small timberland ownerships on which the Nation must rely for an important part of its future timber products. The States are eager to increase their technical assistance to these woodland owners

and the Federal Government should be prepared to carry its share of this program.

#### COST

The bill will authorize appropriations up to \$5 million for this program, an increase of \$2.5 million over the present authorization.

#### DEPARTMENTAL APPROVAL

Following is the letter from the Secretary of Agriculture recommending enactment of H.R. 9728 and providing additional details about the operation of this important program.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
Washington, D.C., July 20, 1962.

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY,  
*Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,*  
*House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your request of March 16, 1962, for a report on H.R. 9728 and H.R. 9953, substantially identical bills to amend the Cooperative Forest Management Act.

This Department recommends enactment of these bills with an amendment as hereinafter discussed.

These bills would amend the Cooperative Forest Management Act of August 25, 1950 (64 Stat. 473; 16 U.S.C. 568c, 568d), by increasing the sum authorized to be appropriated annually to carry out the provisions of the act from \$2,500,000 to \$5 million.

The cooperative forest management program is aimed primarily at assisting some 4½ million small forest landowners and approximately 50,000 small sawmill operators and other processors of primary forest products. Assistance includes technical service and advice along such lines as making timber inventory and management plans, selecting proper harvesting methods, marketing forest products, reforestation, stand improvement, selection of harvesting and manufacturing equipment, and processing methods.

The program is carried out in cooperation with the States. The Federal Government's part is to (1) provide financial aid, (2) assist in developing new techniques and processes, (3) assist in training program personnel, and (4) provide appropriate inspections and audits.

The average forest holding of the 4½ million small forest owners in the United States is 59 acres. The 257 million acres in such ownership amount to about half of all the commercial forest land in the Nation and they comprise the most accessible and potentially some of the most productive woodland. Unfortunately, many of these acres are producing at only one-third of their potential timber-growing capacity.

If this large acreage of forest land is to furnish its share of the Nation's future timber supply, sawtimber growth on these lands must be doubled within the next four decades. Likewise, full production of quality timber by these small forest ownerships is necessary to insure full contribution of the resources of these lands in solving the problem of substantial and persistent underemployment in many rural areas.

Neither of these goals can be attained without skillful application of technical forestry practices on these small forest properties. Technical management skills are needed to evaluate the complex factors



of soil, slope, elevation, species, growth, quality, markets, and other variables which make each area different and difficult to prescribe proper silvicultural treatment. Few owners have the necessary technical skills to manage timber crops, nor do many of them have enough timber individually to warrant hiring a forester even on a part-time basis. The same situation confronts them in the difficult jobs of marketing specialized products, preparing sale contracts, and timber harvesting. Similarly, small industries have problems in manufacturing techniques and plant efficiency in connection with the processing of primary forest products.

The cooperative forest management program can effectively contribute toward the solution of these problems by providing landowners with advice and assistance in timber management, marketing, and processing. The 670 service foresters currently employed by the States annually give assistance to some 90,000 small forest owners. However, this amounts to only 2 percent of such owners and frequently individual owners need technical assistance periodically for a number of years. For the fiscal year 1962, planned State appropriations account for \$3,386,000 or 58 percent of the estimated \$5,886,000 total program cost. The States have steadily increased cooperative forest management program funds and increases have been made in Federal appropriations to the limit of \$2,500,000 presently authorized under the act. However, the demands for technical forestry services far exceed the ability of the program under this limitation. The States fully recognize the need to strengthen the program but anticipated increases in State funds alone cannot be expected to carry the load.

The increased annual appropriation which H.R. 9728 and H.R. 9953 would authorize would open the way for greater Federal participation as may be found necessary. We, therefore, recommend that the bills be amended to remove the limitation on appropriations for the cooperative forest management program which they would impose. We believe it is unnecessary to retain a statutory limitation on annual appropriations for these activities since the Congress exercises control over all phases of State and private forestry cooperation through the annual appropriation process and by review of budget requests for specific activities.

The recommended amendment of the bills may be accomplished as follows:

Lines 5 and 6: Strike out all following the word "amended" in line 5 and insert the following:

"To make the first sentence of section 2 read as follows: 'There are hereby authorized to be appropriated annually such sums as may be needed to enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of this Act'."

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN.

#### CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with clause 3 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black

brackets, new matter is printed in italic, and existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

## COOPERATIVE FOREST MANAGEMENT ACT

Act of August 25, 1950 (64 Stat. 473)

An Act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the States to enable them to provide technical services to private forest landowners, and for other purposes.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to cooperate with State foresters or equivalent officials of the several States, Territories, and possessions for the purpose of encouraging the States, Territories, and possessions to provide technical services to private forest landowners and operators, and processors of primary forest products with respect to the management of forest lands and the harvesting, marketing, and processing of forest products, and, where necessary to avoid uneconomic duplication of certain technical and training services, to make such services available to private agencies and persons. All such technical services shall be provided in each State, Territory, or possession in accordance with a plan agreed upon in advance between the Secretary and the State forester or equivalent official of the State, Territory, or possession. The provisions of this Act and the plan agreed upon for each State, Territory, or possession shall be carried out in such manner as to encourage the utilization of private agencies and individuals furnishing services of the type described in this section.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually, to enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of this Act, the sum of **[\$2,500,000]** *\$5,000,000*. Apportionment among the participating States, administrative expenses in connection with cooperative action with such States, and the amount to be expended by the Secretary to make technical services available to private persons and agencies, shall be determined by the Secretary after consultation with a national advisory board of not less than five State foresters or equivalent officials selected by a majority of the State foresters or equivalent officials of all States, Territories, or possessions participating in the program. The amount paid by the Federal Government to any State, Territory, or possession for cooperative action in the State, Territory, or possession shall not exceed during any fiscal year the amount expended by the cooperating State, Territory, or possession for the same purpose during the same fiscal year, and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make such expenditures on the certificate of the appropriate official of the State, Territory, or possession having charge of the cooperative work for the State, Territory, or possession that the expenditures as herein provided have been made: *Provided*, That it is the intent of Congress that the Secretary may continue to cooperate with persons and private agencies in furnishing technical forestry services under existing authority.

SEC. 3. The Act of May 18, 1937 (50 Stat. 188), known as the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act, is hereby repealed effective June 30, 1951.

SEC. 4. This Act shall be known as the Cooperative Forest Management Act.

Union Calendar No. 854

87<sup>TH</sup> CONGRESS  
2<sup>D</sup> SESSION

# H. R. 9728

[Report No. 2067]

---

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 18, 1962

Mr. GRANT introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

JULY 30, 1962

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

## A BILL

To amend the Cooperative Forest Management Act.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3       That the Cooperative Forest Management Act (64 Stat.  
4       473; 16 U.S.C. 568c, 658d) is amended by striking out of  
5       the first sentence of section 2 thereof “\$2,500,000” and  
6       inserting “\$5,000,000”.

I

Union Calendar No. 854

87<sup>TH</sup> CONGRESS  
2<sup>D</sup> SESSION

**H. R. 9728**

[Report No. 2067]

---

---

# **A BILL**

To amend the Cooperative Forest Management  
Act.

---

---

By Mr. GRANT

---

---

JANUARY 18, 1962

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

JULY 30, 1962

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on  
the State of the Union and ordered to be printed







# Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF  
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only;  
should not be quoted  
or cited)

Issued August 7, 1962  
For actions of August 6, 1962  
87th-2d, No. 136

## CONTENTS

|                       |                           |                       |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|
| Buildings.....16      | Forest Service.....17     | Purchasing.....5      |
| Civil defense.....21  | Forestry.....3,7          | Recreation.....3      |
| Electrification.....6 | Loans.....11              | Research.....4,14,25  |
| Extension work.....12 | Mining.....9,10,17        | Science.....4,8       |
| Farm program.....19   | Personnel.....13          | Stockpiling.....15,24 |
| Federal aid.....11,18 | Petrified wood.....9      | Textiles.....20       |
| Feed additives.....22 | Political activity.....13 | Water resources.....1 |
| Foreign trade.....2   | Public facilities.....11  | Wetlands.....23       |

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed bills to: Expand survey of forest resources; Aid States in forestry research; Increase authorization under Cooperative Forest Management Act. Sen. Bush urged postponement of foreign trade bill until completion of British-Common Market negotiations. Senate passed Fryingpan-Arkansas water resource bill. Senate committee reported bill to establish Commission on Science and Technology. Sen. Keating submitted and discussed measure to provide cost study on Federal research grants.

## SENATE

1. WATER RESOURCES. Passed without amendment H. R. 2206, the Fryingpan-Arkansas water resource development bill for the multiple-purpose development of Colorado's water and land resources to provide supplemental irrigation water and municipal and industrial water, flood protection, electric power and energy, fish and wildlife resources, and recreational facilities. This bill will now be sent to the President. (pp. 14641, 14647-71) Rejected an amendment by Sen. Williams, Del., to restrict the total authorization under the bill to \$170 million. (pp. 14660-4) Agreed to a unanimous-consent request by Sen. Carroll earlier in the day that the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee be discharged from further consideration of the bill in order that the Senate could take it up. (p. 14660) Consideration of a similar bill, S. 284, was indefinitely postponed. (p. 14669)
2. FOREIGN TRADE. Sen. Bush expressed concern over the "breakdown in negotiations on the United Kingdom's entry into the European Common Market," urged postpone-

ment of consideration of the foreign trade bill until it is known whether Great Britain will become associated with the Common Market nations, and inserted several items relative to this matter. pp. 14632-40

3. FORESTRY. The Commerce Committee reported an original bill, S. 3614, to authorize the temporary suspension of the Jones Act relative to the shipment of domestic timber (S. Rept. 1846). p. 14631

Sen. Jackson announced that hearings will be held by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on Tues., Aug. 14, on S. 3118, to establish a conservation fund for financing certain outdoor recreation projects. p. 14632

4. RESEARCH. The Government Operations Committee reported with amendments S. 2771, to provide for the establishment of a Commission on Science and Technology (S. Rept. 1828). pp. 14630-1

The Government Operations Committee reported without amendment H. R. 6984, to provide for a method of payment of indirect costs of research and development contracted by the Federal Government at educational institutions (S. Rept. 1826). p. 14630

5. PURCHASING. The Government Operations Committee reported without amendment H. R. 8100, to allow GSA to charge to the consuming agencies the transportation cost of items of supply sent them by request (S. Rept. 1827). p. 14630

6. ELECTRIFICATION. Began debate on S. 3153, to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority (pp. 14684-700). Pending at adjournment was a proposed amendment by Sen. Goldwater to reserve for use in Arizona power which the Federal Government generates in Arizona (pp. 14688-700).

#### HOUSE

7. FORESTRY. Passed under suspension of the rules the following bills:  
~~H. R. 12688, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage and assist the States in carrying on a program of forestry research. pp. 14612-6~~  
~~S. 3064, to increase the authorization for the national survey of forest resources from \$1.5 million to \$2.5 million annually. p. 14616~~  
H. R. 9728, to amend the Cooperative Forest Management Act to increase the appropriation authorization from \$2.5 million to \$5 million. pp. 14616-7

8. SCIENCE AWARDS. Began and concluded debate under suspension of the rules on H. R. 4055, to authorize the payment of a monetary award to recipients of the National Medal of Science (14609-12). Earlier, at the request of Rep. Ford, this bill was passed over without prejudice (p. 14584).
9. PETRIFIED WOOD. Passed as reported H. R. 10540, to exclude deposits of petrified wood from appropriation under the U. S. mining laws. p. 14597
10. MINERALS. Passed as reported H. R. 9280, to amend Sec. 2 of the Materials Act (pp. 14596-7), and H. R. 11049, to provide for the relief of certain oil and gas lessees under the Mineral Leasing Act. p. 14597
11. FEDERAL AID. At the request of Rep. Ford, passed over without prejudice S. 3327, to make certain federally impacted areas eligible for assistance under the public facility loan program. pp. 14598-9
12. EXTENSION WORK. Agreed to without amendment H. Con. Res. 474, extending the greetings and felicitations of the Congress to the Bethel Home Demonstration



my district and so vital to this country.

I see H.R. 12688 as a kind of decentralization of research in forestry. Until now, research in forestry has been dominated by the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture, and they have done a most excellent job. However, I think more divergent ideas and a multiplicity of ideas will be obtained by enlisting the State-supported forestry schools of the Nation.

While I am on my feet, I wish to also endorse the other legislation being brought by this Committee on Agriculture to the floor of the House today. H.R. 9728, a bill to authorize an increase in appropriations and in activities in cooperative forest management deserves support of all of us. One-half of all of the privately owned commercial forest land is in private ownership of small holdings. These are the "wood pile" for tomorrow, and technical assistance is greatly needed to make poorly managed areas more productive. These holdings comprise the most accessible and potentially some of the most productive woodland. This bill will do great service to the Nation by assisting these forest lands to furnish its share of the Nation's future timber supply.

Further, I wish to remark with regard to S. 3064 that it is vital to the Nation that we have an adequate national survey of the forest resources. The additional authorization for a survey, I am sure, we can unanimously agree to.

I recommend all of these bills to my colleagues.

(Mr. OLSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in commending the gentleman from Alabama, Congressman GRANT, chairman of the Subcommittee on Forestry, as well as the gentleman from Maine, Congressman McINTIRE, for their work on behalf of H.R. 12688. I would also like to again commend the gentleman from Alabama for H.R. 9728 and the entire committee for S. 3064. These three bills are of particular importance to the forest economy of the State of Washington and our Nation.

Each supports a different and essential phase of Federal participation in forest management and development. Two are based on a continuing program of proven usefulness and the third is based on a well-demonstrated need.

I trust the House will pass these pieces of legislation as they were reported from the Agriculture Committee—without objection.

H.R. 9728

H.R. 9728 is a bill to amend the Cooperative Forest Management Act to authorize an increase from \$2,500,000 to \$5 million in Federal participation in Federal-State technical assistance programs for small forest and woodland owners.

Under this act, Federal funds are made available on a 50-50 matching basis. State and private expenditures, how-

ever, have been exceeding Federal outlays at a ratio of about 2 to 1.

As the committee report points out, three-fourths of the 435 million acres of State and private forest lands in the United States are held by nearly 4.5 million small woodland owners.

These holdings, properly managed, will provide an important part of the future timber supply of this Nation. I have been advised that 49 States are participating in the Cooperative Forest Management Act and that soon there will be 50.

The Federal Government should be prepared to meet its share.

H.R. 10853

H.R. 10853 is a bill to amend the act of May 22 relating to the comprehensive survey of timber and forest products required to be made by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The amendment raises the authorization ceiling for appropriations necessary to keep the survey current from \$1,500,000 to \$2,500,000.

The present authorization was set in 1949. The increase allows for rising costs involved in carrying out this important work.

H.R. 12688

H.R. 12688 is a bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage and assist the several States in carrying on a program of forestry research.

For the past 100 years such assistance has been provided in fields of agriculture research, of which Forest has received a small amount.

The need is great to step up the total research effort in the production, protection and utilization of forest resources. Land grant and forestry colleges are in a position to participate in such effort on a 50-50 matching funds basis, which this measure provides.

This and the two measures previously mentioned have my wholehearted support. I hope the House recognizes the need for their enactment.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the bill now before us is designed to advance forestry research by providing Federal matching grants to land-grant colleges and other State-supported institutions qualified to conduct research in forestry.

This bill has the strong support of the Forest Service, officials of the land-grant colleges, as well as members of the private lumber industry. The distinguished gentleman from Maine [Mr. McINTIRE] who is the author of this bill, states that in the hearings held by the House Subcommittee on Forests not a single witness appeared to offer testimony in opposition to this legislation.

If enacted, it will mark another forward step in the field of forestry research and will no doubt result in many long-range benefits to the lumber industry, the general economy, and to the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to support this bill and I urge its passage.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the forest-related industries are a principal economic artery of the Pacific Northwest. They account for the largest single bloc of workers as well as the

largest payroll. Thus it is vital that these industries be assisted in a continuing program of research, modernization, and improvement.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, it is on this basis that I support H.R. 12688, designed to assist forestry research by providing Federal matching grants to land-grant colleges and other State-supported institutions qualified to conduct forestry research. I will add that I am delighted as a Representative from the Portland area of the State of Oregon to support this legislation by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Maine, Representative CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE, from the State of Maine which also contains a city by the same name. The gentleman from Maine, Representative McINTIRE, and I sit on opposite sides of the political aisle and live on opposite coasts of our great country, but we are joined together in support of this bill.

I have received telegrams and letters supporting this legislation from private and public groups in my home State. The director of a very fine forest and agricultural research unit at Oregon State University, Mr. F. E. Price, wholeheartedly endorses the bill. The measure has the support of the Forest Service, the land-grant colleges and the private lumber industry. I understand that not a single opposing witness appeared during hearings on the bill.

Existing programs, such as the Hatch program, do not provide sufficient funds for a forestry research. The bill before us today will strengthen and supplement existing programs. The legislation would stimulate both forestry schools and graduate work in the field. I commend H.R. 12688 for passage, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, for his action in bringing three bills relative to our forest program to the floor today. I know the people of Idaho are grateful to the distinguished chairman and are appreciative of his deep understanding of the problems relative to our forest resources. Idaho ranks second only to Alaska in national forest acreage and that is why every bill affecting forests becomes of special concern to the people there.

The three bills on which the Members will vote today involve cooperative forestry research—H.R. 12688; a forest survey authorization—S. 3064; and an amendment to the Cooperative Forest Management Act—H.R. 9728. I will take them up in that order.

The purpose of the research measure is to specifically establish research in forestry as a definite part of the agricultural research programs now being cooperatively carried out by the Agriculture Department, the land-grant colleges, and their experiment stations and other State-supported educational institutions.

This program as it now stands is on a rather modest scale and it must be broadened considerably if it is to have any kind of meaningful impact on the future.



Research may, indeed, be the key to helping the depressed lumber industry in the Northwest by developing new wood products in the laboratory. I know that this area holds exciting promise for the future in terms of finding yet undreamed-of uses for the byproducts of our forests. These studies are being carried out in the Gem State at the University of Idaho, along with other colleges and experimental stations, as well as by private industry.

This bill would enable Congress to specifically set aside appropriations for cooperative forestry research under the guidance of the Agriculture Department. These funds would then be made available to the States on a matching basis, and would be used to widen this research and bolster the programs which now might be underway in the various States.

The second bill to which I wish to address myself is the forest survey authorization.

This measure would increase from \$1.5 to \$2.5 million the amount authorized to be appropriated annually to keep the timber and forest products survey current. This survey has been undertaken annually since the Congress first initiated the program back in 1928. The data gathered in the survey is the only comprehensive source of basic information on this most important natural resource.

The Congress, from time to time, has increased these authorizations as the need has arisen. The present cost ceiling on this survey program was established in 1949 and costs since then have risen by more than 50 percent.

In addition there is an increasing need for more extensive inventories of our forest and timber resources. What with cuttings, fire losses, and so on, these resources are in a constant state of flux and it is imperative for the various policymaking public agencies to have up-to-date information regarding the production and uses of timber.

I would therefore urge enactment of the bill so that the survey could be effectively continued, with allowance for increases to be made as the demand arises. The production, manufacture, and use of timber products today generates an estimated \$20 billion of gross national product annually.

The third bill—and I am happy to see so many forest bills on the floor in a single day, and believe me this is a rare pleasure—would amend the Cooperative Forest Management Act.

This measure would authorize an increase from \$2.5 to \$5 million in appropriations for Federal participation in the act. Under this program, technical assistance is made available to small forest and woodland owners, of which there are many in Idaho.

It is a fact, for example, that three-fourths of the 435 million acres of State and private forests in this country are held by nearly 4.5 million small woodland owners. An estimated 3.5 million of these are farmers with an average of 49 acres per farm. These small owners hold the "woodpile" of tomorrow in their hands. The technical assistance is

needed in order to enrich these areas, which are often poorly managed and neglected, in order to bring them up to a more productive level.

This program is important because it is the only one of its kind. It is geared to help the owner of a small chunk of timberland. Added up, these small chunks are a sizable resource which the Nation will need in the years ahead.

State and private sources have been making increasing expenditures for these small timber farmers with each passing year. The bill officially recognizes that trend and then sets out to nourish the program with a small increase in Federal funds. These funds will be expended on a 50-50 matching basis with the States taking part in the program.

This, and the other two measures I have discussed, should be passed, for they are important to the people and the future of our country.

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks in the Record on the bill now under consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 12688, as amended?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### FOREST SURVEY AUTHORIZATION

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3064) to amend section 9 of the act of May 22, 1928, as amended, authorizing and directing a national survey of forest resources, as amended.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the last sentence of section 9 of the Act of May 22, 1928, as amended (45 Stat. 669, 702; 16 U.S.C. 581h), is hereby amended by striking out "\$1,500,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$2,500,000".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Alabama explain the purpose of this legislation?

Mr. GRANT. This is indeed a very short bill. It simply amends the present act, directing a national survey of forest resources. At the present time there is an authorization of appropriation of \$1,500,000. The pending bill would increase that sum to \$2,500,000.

There was no objection when the bill was reported out by the full committee. It has the approval of the Department

of Agriculture and all the allied timber and forest industries.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 3064, as amended?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### AMENDING THE COOPERATIVE FOREST MANAGEMENT ACT

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 9728) to amend the Cooperative Forest Management Act.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Cooperative Forest Management Act (64 Stat. 473; 16 U.S.C. 568c, 658d) is amended by striking out of the first sentence of section 2 thereof "\$2,500,000" and inserting "\$5,000,000".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I think it should be pointed out that this is a bill for the small forest and woodland owners. I think it is important to note that three-fourths of the 435 million acres of State and private forest lands in the United States are held by nearly 4.5 million small woodland owners. Of these, 3.5 million are farmers with an average of 49 acres per farm. One-half of all the privately owned commercial forest land is in private ownership. It is these small holdings which comprise the "woodpile" of tomorrow and where technical assistance is badly needed to make poorly managed areas more productive.

This is the only forestry program designed specifically to assist these small timberland ownerships on which the Nation must rely for an important part of its future timber products.

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Iowa is correct. I think this is much-needed legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GRANT] and the Subcommittee on Forests of the Committee on Agriculture for their favorable report on the bill amending the Cooperative Forest Management Act. I have been interested in this farm forestry cooperation between our U.S. Forest Service and the State forest services since it began in 1937. And I am proud that I do not stand alone in this, one of our most popular forestry activities. In fact, many of us who have been



in Congress more than a dozen years will remember that when this original legislation was broadened in 1949 and 1950 there was a great deal of bipartisan support. Congressman GRANT will remember, I am sure, because he and I and at least two dozen other Congressmen and Senators had bills which ultimately resulted in the Cooperative Forest Management Act. Furthermore, during the hearings in 1949 there were 27 personal appearances by Congressmen and Senators and 58 statements were recorded. There were no party lines involved, and now, 13 years later, we can be proud that the program has been a success. As a cosponsor of this bill, I strongly support it.

Never have the farm foresters caught up with the demand for their services to the small woodland owners. Each time a farm forester helps a woodland owner put his land under good management, he is helping to make sales which put money in the farmer's pockets. When this happens the neighboring woodland owners also call for the services of a farm forester. It is practical, down-to-earth benefit which makes the States willing to go ahead of us nationally and provide two to four times as much money as the Federal Government. Ten years ago in Florida we had 11 farm foresters; now we have 30 and still not nearly enough. In fiscal year 1961 Florida spent \$205,517 for this program, while the Federal contribution was only \$53,312. Our budget for the fiscal year just past, 1962, was \$213,850 State and \$100,000 Federal. Florida and other States would like to have this program on a 50-50 basis as intended in the original act; not to cut back on the program but to secure the needed expansion which additional Federal funds would provide for a valuable program. In order to work toward 50-50 matching, the first step is to amend the act from \$2½ to \$5 million. This our Subcommittee on Forestry has wisely done, and I sincerely hope that the entire Congress and the President will agree.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 9728?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### THE SOBLEN CASE

(Mr. WALTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the American public opinion ought to be alerted to the fact that a strange combination of forces is in the process of succeeding to thwart American legal processes and prevent the incarceration of the convicted Soviet spy, Robert Soblen.

Every applicable law and proper procedure were applied in this country before Soblen was convicted and sentenced

for the hideous crime he committed against the country which granted him asylum, a safe haven, and a very prosperous existence. After the Supreme Court of the United States rendered its final decision, someone in this country neglected to place Soblen under surveillance so as to prevent his escape. This neglect occurred notwithstanding the fact that some years ago, in a similar case, that of the Soviet agent Gerhard Eisler, a very similar flight from justice occurred.

As soon as Soblen succeeded in giving our law enforcement agencies "the slip", a strange series of events began to develop abroad, all pointing to the reluctance of some of our professed friends to recognize the decisions of the courts of the United States. Between the political dissertations and the legal niceties, one thing seems to emerge with most disturbing clarity—the desire not to return Soblen to the United States where he was sentenced to pay his debt to the American society.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that any friendly country, or any agency of such a country, including a commercial enterprise controlled by the government of that country, must be immediately notified that they will be held responsible for preventing the decision of the U.S. courts to be carried out.

If the Israel El Al Airline, or any other airline, cooperates in the scheme to liberate this convicted spy, it must be notified that its landing privileges in the United States will be revoked instantly. The United States did this when it revoked the landing privileges of the Polish liner *Batory* after it took Eisler aboard in New York and to this day, fortunately, these privileges have not been restored.

An unfriendly act committed by a friend calls for a retaliation just as strong—or stronger—than that which is meted out a hostile government. I call upon the Secretary of State to cause that such notification of intended retaliation be forthwith served upon responsible officials of the El Al Airline.

#### DUKE DAM AND STEAMPLANT

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, this Congress should authorize, without further delay, Duke Power Co. to build a retaining dam across the Savannah River at Middleton Shoals in my district so that Duke Power Co. can build the largest steamplant in the world in Anderson County.

This proposal by the dynamic, progressive, Duke Power Co. is in keeping with the administration's announced policy of getting the economy moving in the 1960's. The construction of this \$280 million steamplant will not only focus the attention of the industrial world on South Carolina and Georgia, but will aid the unemployed coal miners of Virginia, West Virginia, Kentucky, Pennsylvania, and throughout the East.

It will be a shot in the arm to our depressed railroads. Mr. Speaker, may I remind the House again that Duke's proposed steamplant when finally completed will use \$26 million worth of coal annually—9,500 tons of coal daily, which must be brought in by rail.

Mr. Speaker, the only real solution to our lagging economy is for the Congress and our Federal Government agencies to give the green light at every opportunity to such free enterprise projects as the fantastic Duke proposal. Great fears have been expressed by many Members of the Congress and people throughout the country about milking the cow dry about killing the goose that lays the golden egg, of taxing our industries and payrolls out of existence; now Mr. Speaker, here is an opportunity for the Congress to give the nod of approval to a taxpaying project, to approve more cheap power, to create more jobs and larger payrolls. Duke, upon completion of this steam plant, will pay approximately \$10 million in taxes annually to the Federal Government. It will also pay annually to the State of South Carolina \$7 million in taxes, and to Anderson County \$1 million annually, all of this in addition to the increased revenue from larger payrolls and the related industries.

H.R. 6789 is a very simple bill which authorizes a retaining dam across the Savannah to furnish cooling water for Duke's gigantic steam plant. There is no opposition to H.R. 6789. I have not received one telephone call, nor one letter, nor one telegram from anyone in the United States opposing H.R. 6789. Duke has agreed to spend an additional \$1,300,000 to raise the level of its dam in order to make its operation compatible with any further development of the Savannah River in the future.

This bill must be approved during this session of the Congress so that Duke can complete its planning, build or acquire railroad facilities in 1963 in order that construction may begin promptly in 1964. I trust and believe H.R. 6789 will be approved before adjournment.

#### THE POSTAL WORKERS OF THE CITY OF CHICAGO

(Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and to include a letter.)

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, words carelessly spoken can destroy reputations that good men and women have built by years of dedication.

I know of no finer group of public servants and of God-fearing Americans, as a whole, than those who are employed as postal workers in the city of Chicago. I am much distressed by a story that I find carried nationwide in an Associated Press dispatch. This is to the effect that there is a possibility that thousands of drug addicts may be employed in the Chicago Post Office, and this statement is made on the authority of an unidentified party on what he says are statistics that indicate that 80 percent of



Chicago's unprivileged population use some form of dope.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that this unidentified party did not intend this insult to the postal workers of Chicago. But it is a statement that I cannot permit to go unchallenged. There are bad eggs in every group. No decent person condones wrong-doing, and surely there should be the greatest vigilance in exposing and prosecuting any person, regardless of the group to which he belongs, engaged in the vicious drug trade.

But to indict an entire group of fine, honest Americans because of the conduct of a few is reprehensible. This is not in the spirit of American fair play. I absolve this unidentified person and the Associated Press from any such intent. But I do think that both this unidentified person and the Associated Press should make it crystal clear that the intent was not to cast reflection upon men and women whose reputation is beyond reproach and who are held high in the esteem and affection of the people of Chicago. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include a letter from W. C. Dogherty, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF  
LETTER CARRIERS,  
Washington, D.C., August 2, 1962.

HON. BARRATT O'HARA,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: As a Congressman from Chicago and as an old and valued friend of the National Association of Letter Carriers, I feel that you will be gratified to know that there was not a single letter carrier involved in the dope ring which the Federal Narcotics Bureau recently uncovered in the Chicago Post Office.

The fact that a dope ring of any size or dimension whatsoever exists in a Federal post office is shameful, no matter what employees are participating. However, I deeply resent the implication carried in an Associated Press dispatch of July 28, and attributed to a Narcotics Bureau official, that "there may be thousands of addicts employed in the (Chicago) post office." This is a gross and insulting exaggeration. The Narcotics Bureau official bases his estimate on "statistics published in Washington which indicate that 80 percent of Chicago's underprivileged population use some form of dope." As a Representative from Chicago of many years' standing I know that you will agree that any such statistics, if they exist, are nothing more than vicious nonsense.

I feel that, in defense of the honor of the postal service and in defense of the honor of Chicago, the official making such a wild statement should be identified and the statistics he quotes should be investigated.

The Chicago Post Office (and its substations) employs 25,000 persons. In any such group one is going to find some vicious individuals and some weak characters. These must be rooted out effectively. But no conceivable good, and a great deal of harm, can come from slandering the entire employee force of the Chicago Post Office by making headline-grabbing and sensational statements such as those that have been made.

With warmest personal regards, I remain,  
Yours cordially,

W. C. DOHERTY,  
President, National Association of Letter Carriers.

#### IN MEMORY OF JOHN B. LITTLE

(Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, some persons become widely known by name and face because of the prominent roles they play in the drama of life. History records the passing fame of most; and the enduring fame of a few.

For the multitude who serve as their public there are no cheers, no headlines, no titles of leadership. They are the anonymous ones who find humble satisfaction in helping others, seeking no credit for themselves. They find their sense of worth in doing the job well, in the happiness of family life, and the hobbies they cultivate in their spare time.

John B. Little was one of these self-effacing persons whose patient labor and unswerving faith make up the true strength of our free society. There were not many people outside the Capitol who knew John. Here he was listed as an assistant document clerk.

But John developed a special knowledge that was invaluable to the Members of the House. And as the word spread, more and more Members sought out Johnny for the answers that came from his well-documented memory.

His position was not influential, but he did inspire confidence. In so many small ways he was helpful to the Members that they came to regard him as a trusted friend to whom they could unburden themselves. He was the understanding listener—this humble man who enjoyed our well-placed trust.

Some years ago, Johnny's boy was a student at Sacred Heart Boarding School in Shawsheen Village, next door to my home city of Lawrence, in Massachusetts. On a number of occasions he visited his son and from these experiences he gained both knowledge and affection for the Bay State, its history, traditions, and its people. Johnny liked to exchange reminiscences with me about Massachusetts.

Life is not alone measured by the success of our personal ambitions, the surplus of achievement over failure, the number of eminent and powerful individuals whom we know on a first-name level, the accumulation of this world's goods, or the fulfillment we find in our homes and with our families. It is the little people whom we meet frequently in the course of our work, upon whom we depend so much without realizing it, who become a part of our own lives.

Johnny was one of these.

He called himself a civil servant of this House, but he was much more than that to us.

In the "busyness" of each day and the traffic of details that claim our attention, we have no time to speak from the heart until it is too late.

Friends suddenly depart and we mourn them with regrets for the things we

meant to do and the words we meant to speak.

John B. Little is no longer with us. He has gone to his heavenly rest. Saddened by the loss of his presence, I think of the following prayer-poem by James J. Metcalfe, which comforts me as I am sure it will comfort Johnny's survivors:

#### MY SYMPATHY

The grief of sudden tragedy  
Is poignant as can be  
And all that I can offer you  
Is friendly sympathy.

But my condolence really comes  
Directly from the heart,  
Because I know how sad it is  
When loved ones have to part.

I know you will be lonely  
As the days and nights go by  
And there will be a thousand tears  
That you will want to cry.

And yet we must remember that  
There is a will divine  
And we may never question it  
Or fathom God's design.

And so I grieve with you today  
And say a fervent prayer  
That God will bless and always keep  
Your loved one in His care.

—James J. Metcalfe.

#### A SECOND CHANCE FOR VETERANS TO SIGN UP FOR NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE

(Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, many men and women who served in the Armed Forces of the United States during World War II and the Korean war, did not realize the value of national service life insurance and did not avail themselves of the opportunity to secure this protection for their survivors. Others mistook the advice of the military to sign up for NSLI as a form of pressure; complied in order to conform; but let their policies lapse after they were discharged.

One of the most frequent regrets I have heard expressed by veterans in recent years is:

The biggest mistake that I made was in passing up the bargain-rate Government insurance. A man needed his small service pay for other things. It was a time of war and a man lived from day to day, not thinking of the future. Now that I'm older and with increased responsibilities, I miss this protection for my survivors. Do you think the Government will ever give us a second chance to obtain this coverage?

Military service in war is more rugged than peacetime service, even for those who are never called upon for combat duty. Many a veteran dies before his time because of the demands made upon his physical health during his military service, and the consequences could not be foreseen.

Americans have become more insurance conscious than ever in the past 17 years.

H.R. 12333 does not provide direct financial benefits to a living veteran. It







# Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF  
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only;  
should not be quoted  
or cited)

Issued sept. 6, 1962

For actions of Sept. 5, 1962

87th-2d, No. 159

## CONTENTS

|                        |                        |                          |
|------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Appropriations.....8   | Forestry.....1,3,4,10  | Natural resources.....10 |
| Budget.....5           | Homestead entry.....2  | Petrified wood.....2     |
| Consumers.....12       | Irrigation.....2       | Reclamation.....7        |
| Cooperatives.....6     | Land development.....1 | Research.....1           |
| Extension work.....1   | Lands.....1,2          | Roads.....3              |
| Federal laws.....1     | Lumber.....11          | School lunch.....1       |
| Foreign trade.....9,11 | Minerals.....2         | Taxation.....6           |

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate committee voted to report bills for revised apportionment of school lunch and extension work funds, expanded forestry research, land development program in Alaska, and cooperation with States in administration of agricultural laws. Senate committee reported roads bill. Sen. Neuberger urged removal of Jones Act restrictions on lumber shipments to Puerto Rico. Sen. Humphrey urged discontinuance of administrative budget.

## SENATE

1. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY COMMITTEE. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) without amendment S. 2805, to ~~provide for a program of agricultural land development in Alaska; S. 3589, authorizing acquisition of certain lands in Wright County, Minn., for exchange for State-owned lands in Superior National Forest; S. 3475, to provide further cooperation with the States in the administration and enforcement of certain Federal laws;~~ H. R. 9728, authorizing an increase from \$2.5 million to \$5 million in the annual appropriation under the Cooperative Forest Management Act; H. R. 12589, to revise the formula for the distribution of Federal funds for agricultural extension work; with amendment H. R. 12688, authorizing cooperation with and encouragement of the States in carrying out programs of forestry research; and H. R. 11665, to revise the formula for the apportionment among the States of funds under the National School Lunch Act. p. D808

2. INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. 3335, changing the name of Big Hole Battlefield National Monument to Big Hole National Battle-

field, and acquiring additional land therefor (amended); S. 3530, authorizing acquisition of land along the Delaware River for the creation of Tocks Island National Recreation Area (amended); S. 3160, to amend the act concerning homestead entry on land containing coal, oil, and gas so as to extend its provisions to the townsite laws applicable in Alaska (amended); S. J. Res. 136, to determine the susceptibility of minerals to electrometallurgical processes (amended); H. R. 9280, to give the Secretary of the Interior discretionary authority to sell certain mineral and vegetative materials on public lands by negotiation rather than by competitive bid when in the best interest of the Government; H. R. 10540, to make deposits of petrified wood disposable under the Materials Act; and H. R. 11164, to approve an amendatory repayment contract negotiated with the Quincy Columbia Basis Irrigation District. p. D809

3. ROADS. The Public Works Committee reported with amendments H. R. 12135, the proposed Federal Aid Highway Act of 1962, which includes authorizations for forest highways and forest development roads and trails (S. Rept. 1997). p. 17425
4. FORESTRY. Sen. Neuberger stated that no domestic lumber is now being shipped to Puerto Rico because of certain restrictions of the Jones Act and that she intended to propose an amendment to the foreign trade bill to permit the Secretary of Commerce to waive Jones Act requirements with respect to such lumber shipments to Puerto Rico. p. 17427
5. BUDGET. Sen. Humphrey urged that the present administrative budget be replaced by two budgets, "the current budget covered by current revenues, and the capital budget financed largely by borrowings backed up by capital assets and by earnings from these projects," and stated that "until we scrap the obsolete accounting procedures of the Federal administrative budget, we will be unable to create the dynamism which one has a right to expect from the leader of the free world." pp. 17557-8
6. TAXATION. Continued debate on H. R. 10650, the proposed Revenue Act of 1962 (pp. 17425-7, 17440-556). Agreed to a unanimous-consent agreement that, effective Thurs., Sept. 6, further debate on the bill will be limited to four hours (p. 17516). Sen. McCarthy inserted a statement to clarify the tax status of farmers' cooperatives after Sen. Kerr assured him that "I have a positive conviction that nothing in the bill would lose to a cooperative any tax-exempt status it now has under existing law" (p. 17551).
7. RECLAMATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported without amendment H. R. 575, to authorize construction of the upper division of the Baker reclamation project, Ore. (S. Rept. 1996). p. 17425
8. APPROPRIATIONS. The "Daily Digest" states that a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee "marked up and agreed to report to the Subcommittee on Public Works proposed funds for the Atomic Energy Commission and the Tennessee Valley Authority embodied in H. R. 12900, fiscal 1963 appropriations for public works. p. D808
9. FOREIGN TRADE. Sen. Neuberger submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to H. R. 11970, the foreign trade bill. p. 17425
10. FORESTRY; NATURAL RESOURCES. Sen. Morse inserted his speech at the Western States Democratic Conference at Seattle, Wash., on Aug. 5, in which he discusses legislation relating to forestry, natural resource development, and other subjects. pp. 17569-70







# Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF  
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only;  
should not be quoted  
or cited)

Issued Sept. 10, 1962  
For actions of Sept. 7, 1962  
87th-2d, No. 161

## CONTENTS

|   |                           |                       |
|---|---------------------------|-----------------------|
| Adjournment.....16                      | Electrification.....13,18 | Personnel.....5       |
| Agricultural appro-<br>priations.....15 | Estes.....3               | Property.....9        |
| Agricultural exchange...17              | Extension service.....1   | Public works.....2    |
| Alaska lands.....11,7                   | Foreign affairs.....6     | Research.....1        |
| Appropriations.....8,15                 | Forestry.....1,4          | School lunch.....1    |
| Copyrights.....11                       | Lands.....1,9             | Surplus food.....12   |
| Economic aid.....6                      | Laws.....1                | Transportation.....10 |
|   | Natural resources.....7   | Wildlife.....14       |

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate committee reported bills for revised apportionment of school lunch and extension work funds, expanded forestry research, land development program in Alaska, and cooperation with States in administration of agricultural laws. Senate debated public works acceleration bill. Sen. Tower commended Sen. Mundt's role in Estes investigation. Sen. Humphrey commended shipment of surplus food to Iran.

## SENATE

1. THE AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY COMMITTEE reported the following bills: p. 17722  
H. R. 9728, without amendment, to amend the Cooperative Forest Management Act so as to increase the appropriation authorization from \$2.5 million to \$5 million (S. Rept. 2012).

H. R. 12688, with amendments, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage and assist the States in carrying on a program of forestry research (S. Rept. 2013).

S. 3589, without amendment, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to acquire certain lands in Wright Co., Minn., and exchange them with Minn. for State-owned lands in the Superior National Forest (S. Rept. 2017).

S. 3475, without amendment, to provide further for cooperation with States in the administration and enforcement of certain laws relating to agriculture (S. Rept. 2018).

S. 2805, without amendment, to provide assistance for a program of agricultural land development in Alaska (S. Rept. 2014).

H. R. 11665, with amendments, to revise the formula for apportioning cash assistance funds among the States under the School Lunch Act (S. Rept. 2016).

H.R. 12589, without amendment, to revise the formula for the distribution of any additional Federal funds for agricultural extension work and to provide for quarterly (rather than annual) payments to States for extension work (S. Rept. 2015).

2. PUBLIC WORKS. Began consideration of the House amendments to S. 2965, the public works acceleration bill. pp. 17775-9, 17783-7  
Sens. Cooper and Miller submitted amendments intended to be proposed to this bill, S. 2965. p. 17723, 17783-7
3. ESTES INVESTIGATION. Sen. Tower commended Sen. Mundt's role in the investigation of the Estes and other cases and inserted an article, "Mundt Sorts Good and Bad Guys." pp. 17729-30
4. FORESTRY. Sen. Yarborough urged greater use of public lands, including forest lands, for hunting, fishing, and other forms of recreation, and inserted an article, "Public Hunting in America." pp. 17757-60  
Sen. Morse stated that "great savings can be achieved in school construction" through the use of wood and urged greater use of timber for this purpose. pp. 17779-81
5. PERSONNEL. At the request of Sen. Russell, a Defense Department proposal to exempt certain Reserve officers of the Army or Air Force from the dual compensation restrictions of the Economy Act was rereferred from the Armed Services Committee to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. p. 17723
6. FOREIGN AFFAIRS. Sen. Smith, Maine, inserted a thesis, "The United States Versus the Sino-Soviet Bloc in Latin America," including a discussion of economic aid and foreign trade programs. pp. 17723-9
7. ALASKA. Sen. Gruening inserted an article, "Alaska: Last Frontier," including a discussion of the natural resources of Alaska. pp. 17739-42  
Sen. Gruening praised the Matanuska Valley in Alaska as "the backbone of the State's agricultural economy," and inserted an editorial, "They Tamed the Wilds to Make a Farmland." pp. 17796-7
8. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963. Passed as reported this bill, H. R. 12870. Conferees were appointed. pp. 17760-72
9. LAND: Passed with amendment H. R. 8355, to authorize executive agencies to grant easements in, over, or upon real property of the U. S. under the control of such agencies. pp. 17774-5
10. TRANSPORTATION. Sen. Mundt criticized a strike by the Railway Telegraphers against the Chicago & North Western Railroad and inserted an article stating the strike was holding up grain shipments. pp. 17788-91
11. COPYRIGHTS. Passed without amendment H. J. Res. 627, extending the duration of copyright protection in certain cases. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 17792
12. SURPLUS FOOD. Sen. Humphrey commended Government action to give surplus food to Iran following the recent earthquake disaster. pp. 17792-3
13. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Gruening urged Congressional approval of the Rampart Dam in Alaska and inserted an editorial, "Rampart: An Essential of the Moment." pp. 17797-8



## COOPERATIVE FOREST MANAGEMENT ACT

SEPTEMBER 7, 1962.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, submitted the following

### REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 9728]

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 9728), to amend the Cooperative Forest Management Act, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it do pass without amendment.

This bill increases the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out the Cooperative Forest Management Act from \$2.5 million to \$5 million. That act provides for a cooperative program with the States under which technical assistance is furnished to small forest and woodlot owners. Amounts paid to States are required to be matched by the States.

The attached report from the Department of Agriculture favoring enactment of the bill sets out the need for this legislation.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
Washington, D.C., July 20, 1962.

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY,  
*Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,*  
*House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your request of March 16, 1962, for a report on H.R. 9728 and H.R. 9953, substantially identical bills to amend the Cooperative Forest Management Act.

This Department recommends enactment of these bills with an amendment as hereinafter discussed.

These bills would amend the Cooperative Forest Management Act of August 25, 1950 (64 Stat. 473; 16 U.S.C. 568c, 568d), by increasing the sum authorized to be appropriated annually to carry out the provisions of the act from \$2,500,000 to \$5 million.

The cooperative forest management program is aimed primarily at assisting some 4½ million small forest landowners and approximately 50,000 small sawmill operators and other processors of primary forest



products. Assistance includes technical service and advice along such lines as making timber inventory and management plans, selecting proper harvesting methods, marketing forest products, reforestation, stand improvement, selection of harvesting and manufacturing equipment, and processing methods.

The program is carried out in cooperation with the States. The Federal Government's part is to (1) provide financial aid, (2) assist in developing new techniques and processes, (3) assist in training program personnel, and (4) provide appropriate inspections and audits.

The average forest holding of the 4½ million small forest owners in the United States is 59 acres. The 257 million acres in such ownership amount to about half of all the commercial forest land in the Nation and they comprise the most accessible and potentially some of the most productive woodland. Unfortunately, many of these acres are producing at only one-third of their potential timber-growing capacity.

If this large acreage of forest land is to furnish its share of the Nation's future timber supply, sawtimber growth on these lands must be doubled within the next four decades. Likewise, full production of quality timber by these small forest ownerships is necessary to insure full contribution of the resources of these lands in solving the problem of substantial and persistent underemployment in many rural areas.

Neither of these goals can be attained without skillful application of technical forestry practices on these small forest properties. Technical management skills are needed to evaluate the complex factors of soil, slope, elevation, species, growth, quality, markets, and other variables which make each area different and difficult to prescribe proper silvicultural treatment. Few owners have the necessary technical skills to manage timber crops, nor do many of them have enough timber individually to warrant hiring a forester even on a part-time basis. The same situation confronts them in the difficult jobs of marketing specialized products, preparing sale contracts, and timber harvesting. Similarly, small industries have problems in manufacturing techniques and plant efficiency in connection with the processing of primary forest products.

The cooperative forest management program can effectively contribute toward the solution of these problems by providing landowners with advice and assistance in timber management, marketing, and processing. The 670 service foresters currently employed by the States annually give assistance to some 90,000 small forest owners. However, this amounts to only 2 percent of such owners and frequently individual owners need technical assistance periodically for a number of years. For the fiscal year 1962, planned State appropriations account for \$3,386,000 or 58 percent of the estimated \$5,886,000 total program cost. The States have steadily increased cooperative forest management program funds and increases have been made in Federal appropriations to the limit of \$2,500,000 presently authorized under the act. However, the demands for technical forestry services far exceed the ability of the program under this limitation. The States fully recognize the need to strengthen the program but anticipated increases in State funds alone cannot be expected to carry the load.

The increased annual appropriation which H.R. 9728 and H.R. 9953 would authorize would open the way for greater Federal participation as may be found necessary. We, therefore, recommend that the bills be amended to remove the limitation on appropriations for the cooperative forest management program which they would impose. We believe it is unnecessary to retain a statutory limitation on annual appropriations for these activities since the Congress exercises control over all phases of State and private forestry cooperation through the annual appropriation process and by review of budget requests for specific activities.

The recommended amendment of the bills may be accomplished as follows:

Lines 5 and 6: Strike out all following the word "amended" in line 5 and insert the following:

"To make the first sentence of section 2 read as follows: 'There are hereby authorized to be appropriated annually such sums as may be needed to enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of this Act'."

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN.

#### CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection (4) of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italics, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

#### COOPERATIVE FOREST MANAGEMENT ACT

Act of August 25, 1950 (64 Stat. 473)

An Act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the States to enable them to provide technical services to private forest landowners, and for other purposes.

*Be enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to cooperate with State foresters or equivalent officials of the several States, Territories, and possessions for the purpose of encouraging the States, Territories, and possessions to provide technical services to private forest landowners and operators, and processors of primary forest products with respect to the management of forest lands and the harvesting, marketing, and processing of forest products, and, where necessary to avoid uneconomic duplication of certain technical and training services, to make such services available to private agencies and persons. All such technical services shall be provided in each State, Territory, or possession in accordance with a plan agreed upon in advance between the Secretary and the State forester or equivalent official of the State, Territory, or possession. The provisions of this Act, and the plan agreed upon for each State, Territory, or possession shall be carried

out in such manner as to encourage the utilization of private agencies and individuals furnishing services of the type described in this section.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually, to enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of this Act, the sum of **[\$2,500,000]** *\$5,000,000*. Apportionment among the participating States, administrative expenses in connection with cooperative action with such States, and the amount to be expended by the Secretary to make technical services available to private persons and agencies, shall be determined by the Secretary after consultation with a national advisory board of not less than five State foresters or equivalent officials selected by a majority of the State foresters or equivalent officials of all States, Territories, or possessions participating in the program. The amount paid by the Federal Government to any State, Territory, or possession for cooperative action in the State, Territory, or possession shall not exceed during any fiscal year the amount expended by the cooperating State, Territory, or possession for the same purpose during the same fiscal year, and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make such expenditures on the certificate of the appropriate official of the State, Territory, or possession having charge of the cooperative work for the State, Territory, or possession that the expenditures as herein provided have been made: *Provided*, That it is the intent of Congress that the Secretary may continue to cooperate with persons and private agencies in furnishing technical forestry services under existing authority.

SEC. 3. The Act of May 18, 1937 (50 Stat. 188), known as the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act, is hereby repealed effective June 30, 1951.

SEC. 4. This Act shall be known as the Cooperative Forest Management Act.





Calendar No. 1973

87<sup>TH</sup> CONGRESS  
2<sup>D</sup> SESSION

# H. R. 9728

[Report No. 2012]

---

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

AUGUST 7, 1962

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

SEPTEMBER 7, 1962

Reported by Mr. EASTLAND, without amendment

---

## AN ACT

To amend the Cooperative Forest Management Act.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3       That the Cooperative Forest Management Act (64 Stat.  
4       473; 16 U.S.C. 568c, 658d) is amended by striking out of  
5       the first sentence of section 2 thereof “\$2,500,000” and  
6       inserting “\$5,000,000”.

Passed the House of Representatives August 6, 1962.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

*Clerk.*



Calendar No. 1973

87<sup>TH</sup> CONGRESS  
2<sup>D</sup> Session

**H. R. 9728**

[Report No. 2012]

---

---

**AN ACT**

To amend the Cooperative Forest Management  
Act.

---

---

AUGUST 7, 1962

Read twice and referred to the Committee on  
Agriculture and Forestry

SEPTEMBER 7, 1962

Reported without amendment





# Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF  
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only;  
should not be quoted  
or cited)

Issued Sept. 13, 1962  
For actions of Sept. 12, 1962  
87th-2d, No. 164

## CONTENTS

|  |   |                                    |
|--|---|------------------------------------|
| Acres allotments....3,13               | Estes.....13                            | Household effects.....9            |
| Administrative pro-<br>visions.....3   | Farm program.....1                      | Imports.....9,17                   |
| Agricultural appro-<br>priations.....2 | Federal-State<br>cooperation.....3,8,15 | Information.....11                 |
| Appropriations.....2                   | FHA loans.....3                         | Lands.....3                        |
| Cotton.....13,17                       | Foreign aid.....2                       | Law enforcement.....3              |
| Crop insurance.....3                   | Foreign trade.....16,17                 | Livestock disease.....3            |
| Economics.....14,18                    | Forest Service.....3,7                  | Loans.....3                        |
| Employment.....14                      | Forestry.....3,7                        | Lobbying.....6                     |
|  | Guam.....3                              | Lumber.....3                       |
|  |   | Monopolies.....5                   |
|  |   | Personnel.....9                    |
|  |   | Poultry disease.....3              |
|  |   | Rice.....3                         |
|  |   | Roads.....4                        |
|  |   | Sec. 32 funds.....3                |
|  |   | Tobacco.....3                      |
|  |   | Vocational education....12         |
|  |   | Water resources.....15             |
|  |   | Wetlands.....3                     |
|  |   | Youth Conservation<br>Corps.....10 |

HIGHLIGHTS: House committee voted to report bills to increase number of new counties eligible for crop insurance, further restrict interstate movement of diseased livestock and poultry, increase limitation on FHA loans, extend time for leasing tobacco allotments, facilitate work of Forest Service, facilitate USDA administrative operations, and provide cooperation with States in administration of agricultural laws. Conferees granted permission to file conference report on USDA appropriation bill by midnight, Sept. 12. Senate passed bills to: Increase authorization for Cooperative Forest Management Act. Provide for cooperation with States in administration of agricultural laws. Senate concurred in House amendment to bill to expand survey of forest resources. Sen. Morse discussed recent criticisms of administration of national forests.

## HOUSE

1. FARM PROGRAM. The "Daily Digest" states that "Conferees continued, in executive session, to resolve the differences between the Senate- and House-passed versions of H. R. 12391, proposed Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, and reached tentative agreement thereon, and will meet again on Friday, September 14."  
p. D834
2. APPROPRIATIONS. The conferees were granted until midnight Wed., to file a conference report on H. R. 12648, the agricultural appropriation bill for 1963.  
p. 18127  
Received and agreed to the conference report on H. R. 12870, the military construction appropriation bill (H. Rept. 2356). pp. 18173-6, 18178  
The Appropriations Committee was granted permission to report the foreign aid appropriation bill on Tues., Sept. 18, and bring it to the floor on Thurs., Sept. 20. p. 18132



3. AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE. The Agriculture Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. 2859, to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, in order to increase from 100 to 150 the number of new counties in which crop insurance may be offered each year; S. 3120, to grant the Secretary of Agriculture additional authority to permit the interstate movement of certain diseased livestock and poultry; H. R. 11111, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell and convey certain forest lands in Iowa; H. R. 12434 (amended), omnibus bill to facilitate the work of the Forest Service; H. R. 12653 (amended), to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 in order to increase the limitation on the amount of loans which may be insured under subtitle A of such Act; H. R. 12855 (amended), relating to the lease and transfer of tobacco acreage allotments; H. R. 12811 (amended), omnibus bill to facilitate the work of the Department of Agriculture; H. R. 12802, to provide further for cooperation with States in administration and enforcement of certain Federal laws; and S. 3152, to provide for the nutritional enrichment and sanitary packaging of rice prior to its distribution under certain Federal programs, including the national school lunch program. The Committee passed over without prejudice S. 3517, earmark Sec. 32 funds to establish and carry out a program to promote the flow of domestically produced lumber in commerce; and S. 2121, to establish Federal agricultural services to Guam; and voted to accept Senate amendments to H. R. 8520, to limit financial and technical assistance for drainage of certain wetlands. p. D833
4. ROADS. The Public Works Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. J. Res. 137, to authorize the Secretary of Commerce, in cooperation with Alaska, to undertake studies and surveys relative to a highway construction program for Alaska. p. D834
5. MONOPOLIES. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported with amendment H. J. Res. 636, the proposed Quality Stabilization Act (H. Rept. 2352). p. 18178
6. LOBBYING. Received from the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate the quarterly reports pursuant to the Regulation of Lobbying Act. pp. 18180-211

SENATE

7. FORESTRY. Passed without amendment H. R. 9728, to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out the Cooperative Forest Management Act from \$2.5 million to \$5 million. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 18071-2

Passed without amendment S. 3589, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to acquire certain lands in Wright County, Minn., and exchange them with Minn. for State-owned lands in the Superior National Forest. p. 18072

Concurred in the House amendment to S. 3064, to increase the authorization for the national survey of forest resources from \$1.5 to \$2.5 million annually. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 18073

Passed with amendment S. 3335, to revise the boundaries of the Big Hole Battlefield National Monument, Mont., including the transfer of land from the Beaverhead National Forest to the Monument. p. 18073

Sen. Morse discussed recent criticism of the administration of the national forests and stated that "Secretary Freeman is now addressing himself to this problem" and that "These times require a reassessment of procedures, a reanalysis of attitudes, the communication of ideas, but most of all an improvement in performance." pp. 18106-7



Orleans, La., Biloxi, Miss., and Corpus Christi, Tex., were paid such allowances from July 1, 1958, to May 23, 1961. Payments were made because of the opinion of the commander of the 8th Coast Guard District, that, under the circumstances described below, Government mess facilities were not reasonably available to his men. This decision, which was made in good faith, with no suggestion of fraud or collusion, went unquestioned for 6 years.

"This committee is advised that the detachments involved are important components of a tightly integrated air-sea rescue net maintained on the gulf coast by the Coast Guard which are kept in an extremely high state of operational readiness. They routinely launch fully manned and equipped aircraft within minutes of a call. These detachments do not have general mess facilities of their own. The units involved were located within limits of other services which provide general mess facilities and which could be used by Coast Guard enlisted personnel under interservice agreements.

"The commander's decision that such services were not reasonably available was made on the basis that subsistence allowances permitted the necessary facilities of other services would have required the men to change uniforms before each meal, travel one-quarter to 1 mile from their work, conform to meal schedules and "buck" chowlines. By authorizing subsistence allowances, the men brought meals from home or purchased them locally, usually from vending machines near the job, which resulted in less lost time from work and immediate availability for rescue calls. On these facts, this committee agrees that it is clear that the commander based his decision on operational needs for justifiable reasons.

"In the spring of 1961, a General Accounting Office auditing team questioned the payments and the Comptroller General, by ruling B-146491, issued February 16, 1962, approved the invalidation of payments made from July 1, 1958. In the absence of legislative relief, repayments of \$100,177.07 must be made to the Government by enlisted men.

The Comptroller General based his decision on a provision of the Career Compensation Act which provides that rations in kind are to be deemed available if a general mess is maintained "at the activity where the enlisted men are serving, or within a reasonable distance thereof." Literal interpretation of this provision, using only the factor of distance, supports the view of the General Accounting Office, but entirely overlooks the need for immediate availability of these rescue crews on which the commander's decision was founded.

"Such an approach actually failed to take into account the practical considerations surrounding the Coast Guard decision, for it would be an unwarranted hardship to require enlisted men who had no reason to question the commander's decision which they accepted in good faith to make repayment for rations they received back to July 1, 1958, in lieu of Government rations never furnished. They would be penalized, because of an error of technical interpretation beyond their control. The error has now been corrected by terminating subsistence payments.

"This committee has considered the provisions of section 2, which would make it possible for the Comptroller General to relieve certifying officers of the Coast Guard in connection with the payments referred to in the bill. Obviously, the payments were certified on the basis of a determination of the military commander that no Government mess was available to the personnel of the units concerned. In each instance, this determination was made on the basis of the particular military mission of the units and their required high state of operational

readiness. Under these circumstances, this committee feels that the relief provided for in section 2 is clearly justified."

The committee believes that the bill is meritorious and recommends it favorably.

Attached and made a part of this report is a letter, dated June 28, 1962, from the Secretary of the Treasury to the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

#### YU SUI WING

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3282) for the relief of Yu Sui Wing, also known as Yee Shui Ling which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 4, after the word "Act", to strike out "Yu Sui Wing" and insert "Yu Sui Ling"; so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, for the purpose of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Yu Sui Ling, also known as Yee Shui Ling, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born minor alien child of Yee Ngon Tom, citizen of the United States: *Provided,* That no natural parent of the beneficiary, by virtue of such parentage, shall be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Yu Sui Ling, also known as Yee Shui Ling."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 2019), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### AMENDMENTS

1. In line 4, change the name "Yu Sui Wing" to read "Yu Sui Ling."
2. Amend the title of the bill so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Yu Sui Ling, also known as Yee Shui Ling."

#### PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to deem Yu Sui Ling, also known as Yee Shui Ling, to be the natural-born minor alien child of her stepfather, a citizen of the United States. The bill has been amended to correct the spelling of the beneficiary's name.

#### STATEMENT OF FACTS

The beneficiary of the bill is a 21-year-old native and citizen of China, born out of wedlock, who has resided in Hong Kong since 1951. Her putative mother, a lawful permanent resident of the United States since 1950, and her stepfather, a U.S. citizen, are the sponsors of the bill, having been supporting her since 1951 after her adoptive parents were killed in China. The records of the beneficiary's birth are not available because it occurred in Communist held territory. Her mother and stepfather reside in Phoenix, Ariz., where they operate a food market.

#### DR. HASSEN M. NOURI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3452) for the relief of Dr. Hassen M. Nouri, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary,

with an amendment, in line 4, after the word "Doctor", to strike out "Hassen" and insert "Hassan"; so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Hassan M. Nouri shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on July 3, 1957.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Doctor Hassan M. Nouri."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 2011), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Dr. Hassan M. Nouri as of July 3, 1957, the date he was first admitted to the United States. The purpose of the amendments is to correct the spelling of the beneficiary's name.

#### STATEMENT OF FACTS

The beneficiary of the bill is a 30-year-old native and citizen of Syria, who entered the United States on July 3, 1957, as an exchange visitor. He was granted a waiver of the 2-year foreign residence requirement on April 4, 1962, and his status was adjusted to that of permanent residence on April 16, 1962. He is married to a U.S. citizen and resides with his wife and two citizen children in St. Louis, Mo. He is employed as resident physician at City Hospital there. He has agreed to accept an appointment to the full-time staff at the hospital and it is stated that in order to be completely effective in this position, it is necessary for him to be licensed to practice in Missouri. He cannot obtain such license until he has acquired U.S. citizenship.

#### COOPERATIVE FOREST MANAGEMENT ACT

The bill (H.R. 9728) to amend the Cooperative Forest Management Act was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 2012), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 9728), to amend the Cooperative Forest Management Act, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it do pass without amendment.

This bill increases the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out the Cooperative Forest Management Act from \$2.5 million to \$5 million. That act provides for a cooperative program with the States under which technical assistance is furnished to small forest and woodlot owners. Amounts paid to States are required to be matched by the States.



The attached report from the Department of Agriculture favoring enactment of the bill sets out the need for this legislation.

### SUPERIOR NATIONAL FOREST, MINN.

The bill (S. 3589) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to acquire certain lands in Wright County, Minn., and exchange them with the State of Minnesota for State-owned lands in the Superior National Forest, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, upon the application by the State of Minnesota and the agreement by the State to exchange for such lands State-owned lands in the Superior National Forest, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to acquire not to exceed one thousand acres in sections 3, 4, 9, and 10, township 121 north, range 26 west, in Wright County, Minnesota. Upon such acquisition the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to exchange such lands for State-owned lands in the Superior National Forest suitable for administration as a part thereof and having a value not less than that of the lands in Wright County to be exchanged therefor as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be needed to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 2017), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3589) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to acquire certain lands in Wright County, Minn., and exchange them with the State of Minnesota for State-owned lands in the Superior National Forest, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it do pass without amendment.

S. 3589 authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to acquire up to 1,000 acres in certain townships in Wright County, Minn., and to exchange such lands with the State of Minnesota for State-owned lands within the Superior National Forest of at least equal value. The lands would not be purchased by the Secretary unless it is requested by the State of Minnesota, and acquisition must be preceded by an agreement with the State for exchange of the lands so purchased. A State law approved in 1947 already provides specifically for the proposed exchange.

There are many parcels of State-owned land intermingled with or surrounded by national forest lands, and acquisition of some of these tracts would serve to consolidate the national forest, thereby allowing more efficient and economical administration. The lands proposed to be purchased by the Secretary and exchanged with the State are to be established as a State park.

A favorable report on the bill from the Department of Agriculture is attached hereto.

### FEDERAL AND STATE LAWS AND REGULATIONS RELATING TO THE MARKETING OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

The bill (S. 3475) to provide further for cooperation with States in administration and enforcement of certain Federal laws was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, in order to avoid duplication of functions, facilities, and personnel, and to attain closer coordination and greater effectiveness and economy in administration of Federal and State laws and regulations relating to the marketing of agricultural products and to the control or eradication of plant and animal diseases and pests, the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized, in the administration and enforcement of such Federal laws within his area of responsibility, whenever he deems it feasible and in the public interest, to enter into cooperative arrangements with State departments of agriculture and other State agencies charged with the administration and enforcement of such State laws and regulations and to provide that any such State agency which has adequate facilities, personnel, and procedures, as determined by the Secretary, may assist the Secretary in the administration and enforcement of such Federal laws and regulations to the extent and in the manner he deems appropriate in the public interest.

Further, the Secretary is authorized to coordinate the administration of such Federal laws and regulations wherever feasible. However, nothing herein shall affect the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture under any Federal law, or any authority to cooperate with State agencies or other agencies or persons under existing provisions of law, or affect any restrictions of law upon such cooperation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 2018), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3475) to provide further for cooperation with States in administration and enforcement of certain Federal laws, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it do pass without amendment.

This bill provides for the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with State agencies in the administration and enforcement of Federal laws and regulations relating to the marketing of agricultural products and to the control or eradication of plant and animal diseases and pests. Under the terms of the bill, the Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements with State departments of agriculture or other State agencies whenever he determines it feasible and in the public interest. Such cooperation is designed to avoid duplication of functions, facilities, and personnel, and attain closer coordination and greater effectiveness and economy in the administration of Federal and State laws.

S. 3475 does not affect the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture and would clarify and reemphasize a longstanding intent

of Congress. While many of the statutes on marketing of agricultural commodities and control and eradication of plant and animal diseases and pests presently provide for cooperation with the States, others are silent on the subject and some impose restrictions on such cooperative administration. The bill would provide a common authority for cooperation with the States in the specified fields. The report from the Department of Agriculture, favoring enactment of the bill, is attached herewith.

### CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE STATE OF MARY- LAND

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3019) to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the State of Maryland which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 3, line 6, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$2,245,000" and insert "\$3,480,000"; and at the beginning of line 17, to strike out "\$1,045,000" and insert "the fair market value for the fixed improvements thereon, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, such fair market value to be determined as of the effective date of the subject contract."; so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, in order to make the land described in the second section of this Act and fixed improvements thereon available for transfer to the State of Maryland, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to relocate the existing activities now being performed on such land in improvements, and to acquire land and interests therein for such purposes, to construct improvements thereon, and to remove the nonfixed improvements and equipment from the buildings to be conveyed. The Secretary for the purposes of this Act is also authorized to receive and accept money and property, real or personal, or interests therein, and services as a gift, bequest, or contribution; and may conduct activities or projects in cooperation with any person, firm, agency, or organization, Federal, State, or private.

SEC. 2. The land referred to in the first section of this Act, which land was heretofore donated to the United States by the State of Maryland, is situated on the campus of the University of Maryland at College Park, Maryland, and is more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at the southeast corner of an original 20.56-acre tract of land conveyed to the United States by deed dated November 9, 1935, and recorded April 20, 1939, in book 521, page 43 of the land records of Prince Georges County, said corner being marked by a cross cut in an iron grating on the north side of University land and immediately north of Symons Hall of the University of Maryland; thence with the east boundary of the original 20.56-acre tract, north 0 degrees 30 minutes 00 seconds west 681.94 feet to a point; thence south 89 degrees 30 minutes 00 seconds west 701.88 feet to a point; thence south 40 degrees 47 minutes 04 seconds west 406.34 feet to a point; thence south 0 degrees 30 minutes 00 seconds east 376.60 feet to a point; thence north 89 degrees 30 minutes 00 seconds east 970.00 feet to the point of beginning and









Public Law 87-680  
87th Congress, H. R. 9728  
September 25, 1962

## An Act

76 STAT. 569.

---

To amend the Cooperative Forest Management Act.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Cooperative Forest Management Act (64 Stat. 473; 16 U.S.C. 568c, 568d) is amended by striking out of the first sentence of section 2 thereof "\$2,500,000" and inserting "\$5,000,000".

Approved September 25, 1962.

